DISCARDED
WIDENER UNIVERSITY

THE

AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH

BY

JAMES BRYCE

AUTHOR OF "THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE"

M.P. FOR ABERDEEN

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II

THE PARTY SYSTEM — PUBLIC OPINION — ILLUSTRATIONS AND REFLECTIONS — SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

THIRD EDITION

COMPLETELY REVISED THROUGHOUT

WITH ADDITIONAL CHAPTERS

New York

MACMILLAN AND CO.

AND LONDON

1895

All rights reserved

PENNSYLVANIA MILITARY COLLEGE LIBRARY

JK246
B9
1895
v. 2
c. 2

COPYRIGHT, 1894,
BY MACMILLAN AND CO.

Set up and electrotyped December, 1894. Reprinted February, 1895.

3003

Norwood Press:
J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

CONTENTS

PART III — The Party System

CHAP.		PAGE
LIII.	Political Parties and their History	3
LIV.	The Parties of To-day	21
LV.	Composition of the Parties	30
LVI.	Further Observations on the Parties	39
LVII.	The Politicians	55
LVIII.	Why the Best Men do not go into Politics	69
LIX.	Party Organizations	76
LX.	The Machine	82
LXI.	What the Machine has to do	90
LXII.	How the Machine Works	97
LXIII.	Rings and Bosses	107
LXIV.	Local Extension of Rings and Bosses	120
LXV.	Spoils	131
LXVI.	Elections and their Machinery	142
LXVII.	Corruption	154
XVIII.	The War against Bossdom	166
LXIX.	Nominating Conventions	175
LXX.	The Nominating Convention at Work	185
LXXI.	The Presidential Campaign	203
LXXII.	The Issues in Presidential Elections	213
XXIII.	Further Observations on Nominations and Elections	220
XXIV.	Types of American Statesmen	228
LXXV.	What the People Think of it	237

PART IV — Public Opinion

CHAP.		PAG
LXXVI.	The Nature of Public Opinion	24
LXXVII.	Government by Public Opinion	25
LXXVIII.	How Public Opinion Rules in America	26
LXXIX.	Organs of Public Opinion	27
LXXX.	National Characteristics as Moulding Public Opinion	28
LXXXI.	Classes as Influencing Opinion	29
LXXXII.	Local Types of Opinion — East, West, and South	30
LXXXIII.	The Action of Public Opinion	31
LXXXIV.	The Tyranny of the Majority	33
LXXXV.	The Fatalism of the Multitude	34
LXXXVI.	Wherein Public Opinion Fails	35
LXXXVII.	Wherein Public Opinion Succeeds	36

PART V — Illustrations and Reflections

LXXXVIII.	The Tammany Ring in New York City	37
LXXXIX.	The Philadelphia Gas Ring	40
XC.	Kearneyism in California	42
XCI.	The Home of the Nation	44
XCII.	The South since the War	46
XCIII.	Present and Future of the Negro	49
XCIV.	Foreign Policy and Territorial Extension	52
XCV.	Laissez Faire	53
XCVI.	Woman Suffrage	54
XCVII.	The Supposed Faults of Democracy	56
XCVIII.	The True Faults of American Democracy	57
XCIX.	The Strength of American Democracy	59
C.	How far American Experience is Available for Europe	61

PART VI — Social Institutions

CHAP.		PAGE
CI.	The Bar	617
CII.	The Bench	632
CIII.	Railroads	643
CIV.	Wall Street	655
CV.	The Universities	663
CVI.	The Churches and the Clergy	695
CVII.	The Influence of Religion	714
CVIII.	The Position of Women	728
CIX.	Equality	744
CX.	The Influence of Democracy on Thought	757
CXI.	Creative Intellectual Power	767
CXII.	The Relation of the United States to Europe	781
CXIII.	The Absence of a Capital	791
CXIV.	American Oratory	799
CXV.	The Pleasantness of American Life	808
CXVI.	The Uniformity of American Life	816
CXVII.	The Temper of the West	829
CXVIII.	The Future of Political Institutions	840
CXIX.	Social and Economic Future	854

PENDIX 875

DEX 881

PART III

THE PARTY SYSTEM

CHAPTER LIII

POLITICAL PARTIES AND THEIR HISTORY

In the preceding chapters I have endeavoured to describe e legal framework of American government as it exists both the nation and in the States. Beginning from the Federal l State Constitutions we have seen what sort of a structure s been erected upon them as a foundation, what methods of islation and administration have been developed, what ults these methods have produced. It is only occasionally l incidentally that we have had to consider the influence on political bodies and methods of those extra-legal group- s of men called political parties. But the spirit and force party has in America been as essential to the action of the chinery of government as steam is to a locomotive engine; to vary the simile, party association and organization are the organs of government almost what the motor nerves are the muscles, sinews, and bones of the human body. They nsmit the motive power, they determine the directions in ich the organs act. A description of them is therefore a essary complement to an account of the Constitution and ernment; for it is into the hands of the parties that the rking of the government has fallen. Their ingenuity, stim- ted by incessant rivalry, has turned many provisions of the nstitution to unforeseen uses, and given to the legal institu- ns of the country no small part of their present colour.

To describe the party system is, however, much harder than as been to describe those legal institutions. Hitherto we e been on comparatively firm ground, for we have had nite data to rely upon, and the facts set forth have been stly patent facts which can be established from books and uments. But now we come to phenomena for a knowledge which one must trust to a variety of flying and floating

sources, to newspaper paragraphs, to the conversation o
American acquaintances, to impressions formed on the spo
from seeing incidents and hearing stories and anecdotes, th
authority for which, though it seemed sufficient at the time
cannot always be remembered. Nor have I the advantage o
being able to cite any previous treatise on the subject; fo
though the books and articles dealing with the public life o
the United States may be counted by hundreds, I know of n
author who has set himself to describe impartially the actua
daily working of that part of the vast and intricate politica
machine which lies outside the Constitution, nor, what is mor
important still, the influences which sway the men by whon
this machine has been constructed and is daily manipulated
The task, however, cannot be declined; for it is that very par
of my undertaking which, even though imperfectly performed
may be most serviceable to the student of modern politics
A philosopher in Germany, who had mastered all the treatise
on the British Constitution, perused every statute of recen
years, and even followed through the newspapers the debate
in Parliament, would know far less about the government an
politics of England than he might learn by spending a mont
there conversing with practical politicians, and watching th
daily changes of sentiment during a parliamentary crisis or
general election.

So, too, in the United States, the actual working of part
government is not only full of interest and instruction, but
so unlike what a student of the Federal Constitution coul
have expected or foreseen, that it is the thing of all other
which any one writing about America ought to try to portra
In the knowledge of a stranger there must, of course, be seriou
gaps. But since no native American has yet essayed the tas
of describing the party system of his country, it is better tha
a stranger should address himself to it, than that the inquirin
European should have no means of satisfying his curiosit
And a native American writer, even if he steered clear of pa
tisanship, which I think he might, for in no country does on
find a larger number of philosophically judicial observers
politics, would suffer from his own familiarity with many
those very things which a stranger finds perplexing. Th
European and even American readers may find in the sort

rspective which a stranger gets of transatlantic phenomena, ne compensation for his necessarily inferior knowledge of ails.

In America the great moving forces are the parties. The vernment counts for less than in Europe, the parties count more; and the fewer have become their principles and the nter their interest in those principles, the more perfect has come their organization. The less of nature the more of ; the less spontaneity the more mechanism. But before I empt to describe this organization, something must be said the doctrines which the parties respectively profess, and explanation of the doctrines involves a few preliminary rds upon the history of party in America.

Although the early colonists carried with them across the some of the habits of English political life, and others may re been subsequently imitated from the old country, the ties of the United States are pure home growths, developed the circumstances of the nation. The English reader who empts, as Englishmen are apt to do, to identify the great erican parties with his own familiar Whigs and Tories, or n to discover a general similarity between them, had better e up the attempt, for it will lead him hopelessly astray. re and there we find points of analogy rather than of resemnce, but the moment we try to follow out the analogy it aks down, so different are the issues on which English and erican politics have turned.

n the United States, the history of party begins with the nstitutional Convention of 1787 at Philadelphia. In its deis and discussions on the drafting of the Constitution there e revealed two opposite tendencies, which soon afterwards eared on a larger scale in the State Conventions, to which new instrument was submitted for acceptance. These were centrifugal and centripetal tendencies — a tendency to ntain both the freedom of the individual citizen and the ependence in legislation, in administration, in jurisdiction, eed in everything except foreign policy and national deee, of the several States; an opposite tendency to subordate the States to the nation and vest large powers in the ral Federal authority.

he charge against the Constitution that it endangered

State rights evoked so much alarm that some States were induced to ratify only by the promise that certain amendments should be added, which were accordingly accepted in the course of the next three years. When the machinery had been set in motion by the choice of George Washington as president, and with him of a Senate and a House of Representatives, the tendencies which had opposed or supported the adoption of the Constitution reappeared not only in Congress but in the President's cabinet, where Alexander Hamilton, secretary of the treasury, counselled a line of action which assumed and required the exercise of large powers by the Federal government, while Jefferson, the secretary of state, desired to practically restrict its action to foreign affairs. The advocates of a central national authority had begun to receive the name of Federalists, and to act pretty constantly together, when an event happened which, while it tightened their union, finally consolidated their opponents also into a party. This was the creation of the French Republic and its declaration of war against England. The Federalists, who were shocked by the excesses of the Terror of 1793, counselled neutrality, and were more than ever inclined to value the principle of authority, and to allow the Federal power a wide sphere of action. The party of Jefferson, who had now retired from the administration, were pervaded by sympathy with French ideas, were hostile to England whose attitude continued to be discourteous, and sought to restrict the interference of the central government with the States, and to allow the fullest play to the sentiment of State independence, of local independence, of personal independence. This party took the name of Republicans or Democratic Republicans, and they are the predecessors of the present Democrats. Both parties were, of course, attached to Republican government — that is to say, were alike hostile to a monarchy. But the Jeffersonians had more faith in the masses and in leaving things alone, together with less respect for authority, so that in a sort of general way one may say that while one party claimed to be the apostles of Liberty, the other represented the principle of Order.

These tendencies found occasions for combating one another not only in foreign policy and in current legislation, but also in the construction and application of the Constitution. Like

documents, and especially documents which have been
med by a series of compromises between opposite views, it
s and is susceptible of various interpretations, which the
uteness of both sets of partisans was busy in discovering
d expounding. While the piercing intellect of Hamilton
veloped all those of its provisions which invested the Fed-
l Congress and President with far-reaching powers, and
ght to build up a system of institutions which should give
these provisions their full effect, Jefferson and his coadju-
s appealed to the sentiment of individualism, strong in the
sses of the people, and, without venturing to propose alter-
ons in the text of the Constitution, protested against all ex-
sions of its letter, and against all the assumptions of Federal
thority which such extensions could be made to justify.
us two parties grew up with tenets, leaders, impulses, sym-
thies, and hatreds, hatreds which soon became so bitter as
t to spare the noble and dignified figure of Washington him-
f, whom the angry Republicans assailed with invectives the
re unbecoming because his official position forbade him to
ly.[1]

At first the Federalists had the best of it, for the reaction
inst the weakness of the old Confederation which the Union
l superseded disposed sensible men to tolerate a strong
tral power. The President, though not a member of either
ty, was, by force of circumstances, as well as owing to the
luence of Hamilton, practically with the Federalists. But
ing the presidency of John Adams, who succeeded Wash-
ton, they committed grave errors. When the presidential
ction of 1800 arrived, it was seen that the logical and ora-
ical force of Hamilton's appeals to the reason of the nation
l far less than the skill and energy with which Jefferson
yed on their feelings and prejudices. The Republicans
mphed in the choice of their chief, who retained power for
ht years (he was re-elected in 1804), to be peaceably suc-
ded by his friend Madison for another eight years (elected
1808, re-elected in 1812), and his disciple Monroe for eight
rs more (elected in 1816, re-elected in 1820). Their long-
tinued tenure of office was due not so much to their own

[1] In mockery of the title he had won from public gratitude a few years be-
, he was commonly called by them "The stepfather of his country."

merits, for neither Jefferson nor Madison conducted foreig affairs with success, as to the collapse of their antagonists The Federalists never recovered from the blow given in th election of 1800. They lost Hamilton by death in 1804. N other leader of equal gifts appeared, and the party, which ha shown little judgment in the critical years 1810–14, finally disa pears from sight after the second peace with England in 181

One cannot note the disappearance of this brilliant figur to Europeans the most interesting in the earlier history of th Republic, without the remark that his countrymen seem t have never, either in his lifetime or afterwards, duly recog nized his splendid gifts. Washington is, indeed, a far mo perfect character. Washington stands alone and unapproach able, like a snow-peak rising above its fellows into the clea air of morning, with a dignity, constancy, and purity whic have made him the ideal type of civic virtue to succeedin generations. No greater benefit could have befallen th Republic than to have such a type set from the first before th eye and mind of the people. But Hamilton, of a virtue not s flawless, touches us more nearly, not only by the romance his early life and his tragic death, but by a certain ardour an impulsiveness, and even tenderness of soul, joined to a courag equal to that of Washington himself. Equally apt for wa and for civil government, with a profundity and amplitude view rare in practical soldiers or statesmen, he stands in th front rank of a generation never surpassed in history, a ge eration which includes Burke and Fox and Pitt and Gratta Stein and Hardenberg and William von Humboldt, Wellingto and Napoleon. Talleyrand, who seems to have felt for hi something as near affection as that cold heart could feel, sai after knowing all the famous men of the time, that only F and Napoleon were Hamilton's equals, and that he had divin Europe, having never seen it.

This period (1788–1824) may be said to constitute the fir act in the drama of American party history. The peop accustomed hitherto to care only for their several commo wealths, learn to value and to work their new national insti tions. They become familiar with the Constitution itself, partners get to know, when disputes arise among them, t provisions of the partnership deed under which their busine

s to be carried on. It is found that the existence of a cen-
l Federal power does not annihilate the States, so the
prehensions on that score are allayed. It is also discovered
at there are unforeseen directions, such for instance as ques-
ns relating to banking and currency and internal communica-
ns, through which the Federal power can strengthen its hold
the nation. Differences of view and feeling give rise to
ties, yet parties are formed by no means solely on the basis
general principles, but owe much to the influence of promi-
nt personalities, of transient issues, of local interests or prej-
ices. The small farmers and the Southern men generally
low the Republican standard borne aloft by the great State
Virginia, while the strength of the Federalists lies in New
gland and the middle States, led sometimes by Massachu-
ts, sometimes by Pennsylvania. The commercial interest
s with the Federalists, and the staid solid Puritanism of all
sses, headed by the clergy. Some one indeed has described
struggle from 1796 to 1808 as one between Jefferson, who
s an avowed free-thinker, and the New England ministers;
l no doubt the ministers of religion did in the Puritan States
rt a political influence approaching that of the Presbyterian
rgy in Scotland during the seventeenth century. Jefferson's
portance lies in the fact that he became the representative
merely of democracy, but of local democracy, of the notion
t government is hardly wanted at all, that the people are
e to go right if they are left alone, that he who resists
hority is *prima facie* justified in doing so, because authority
prima facie tyrannical, that a country where each local body
its own local area looks after the objects of common con-
n, raising and administering any such funds as are needed,
is interfered with as little as possible by any external
ver, comes nearest to the ideal of a truly free people. Some
ervention on the part of the State there must be, for the
te makes the law and appoints the judges of appeal; but
less one has to do with the State, and *a fortiori* the
one has to do with the still less popular and more
roaching Federal authority, so much the better. Jefferson
ressed this view on his countrymen with so much force and
n personal faith that he became a sort of patron saint of
dom in the eyes of the next generation, who used to name

their children after him,[1] and to give dinners and deliver high-flown speeches on his birthday, a festival only second in importance to the immortal Fourth of July. He had borrowed from the Revolutionists of France even their theatrical ostentation of simplicity. He rejected the ceremonial with which Washington had sustained the chief magistracy of the nation, declaring that to him there was no majesty but that of the people.

As New England was, by its system of local self-government through the town meeting, as well as by the absence of slavery, in some respects the most democratic part of the United States, it may seem surprising that it should have been a stronghold of the Federalists. The reason is to be found partly in its Puritanism, which revolted at the deism or atheism of the French revolutionists, partly in the interests of its shipowners and merchants, who desired above all things a central government which, while strong enough to make and carry out treaties with England and so secure the development of American commerce, should be able also to reform the currency of the country and institute a national banking system. Industrial as well as territorial interests were already beginning to influence politics. That the mercantile and manufacturing classes, with all the advantages given them by their wealth, their intelligence, and their habits of co-operation, should have been vanquished by the agricultural masses, may be ascribed partly to the fact that the democratic impulse of the War of Independence was strong among the citizens who had grown to manhood between 1780 and 1800, partly to the tactical errors of the Federalist leaders, but largely also to the skill which Jefferson showed in organizing the hitherto undisciplined battalions of Republican voters. Thus early in American history was the secret revealed, which Europe is only now discovering, that in free countries with an extended suffrage, numbers without organization are helpless and with it omnipotent.

I have ventured to dwell on this first period, because being the first it shows the origin of tendencies which were to gov

[1] It is related of a New England clergyman that when, being about to baptize a child, he asked the father the child's name, and the father replied "Thomas Jefferson," he answered in a loud voice, "No such unchristian name! John Adams, I baptize thee," with the other sacramental words of the rite.

1 the subsequent course of party strife. But as I am not iting a history of the United States I pass by the particular ues over which the two parties wrangled, most of them long ice extinct. One remark is however needed as to the view ich each took of the Constitution. Although the Federal- s were in general the advocates of a loose and liberal con- uction of the fundamental instrument, because such a con- uction opened a wider sphere to Federal power, they were dy, whenever their local interests stood in the way, to ist Congress and the executive, alleging that the latter re overstepping their jurisdiction. In 1814 several of the w England States, where the opposition to the war then ng waged with England was strongest, sent delegates to convention at Hartford, which, while discussing the best ans for putting an end to the war and restricting the pow- of Congress in commercial legislation, was suspected of ditating a secession of the trading States from the Union. the other hand, the Republicans did not hesitate to stretch their utmost, when they were themselves in power, all the hority which the Constitution could be construed to allow the executive and the Federal government generally. The dest step which a president has ever taken, the purchase m Napoleon of the vast territories of France west of the ssissippi which went by the name of Louisiana, was taken Jefferson without the authority of Congress. Congress sequently gave its sanction. But Jefferson and many of friends held that under the Constitution even Congress l not the power to acquire new territories to be formed into tes. They were therefore in the dilemma of either violat- the Constitution or losing a golden opportunity of secur- the Republic against the growth on its western frontier of owerful and possibly hostile foreign State. Some of them ed to refute their former arguments against a lax construc- n of the Constitution, but many others avowed the dangerous trine that if Louisiana could be brought in only by break- down the walls of the Constitution, broken they must be.[1]

[1] The best authorities now hold that the Constitution does permit the eral government to acquire the new territory, and Congress to form States of it. Many of the Federalist leaders warmly opposed the purchase, but far-seeing patriotism of Hamilton defended it.

The disappearance of the Federal party between 1815 and 1820 left the Republicans masters of the field. But in the United States if old parties vanish nature quickly produces new ones. Sectional divisions soon arose among the men who joined in electing Monroe in 1820, and under the influence of the personal hostility of Henry Clay and Andrew Jackson (chosen President in 1828), two great parties were again formed (about 1830) which some few years later absorbed the minor groups. One of these two parties carried on, under the name of Democrats, the dogmas and traditions of the Jeffersonian Republicans. It was the defender of States' Rights and of a restrictive construction of the Constitution; it leaned mainly on the South and the farming classes generally, and it was therefore inclined to free trade. The other section, which called itself at first the National Republican, ultimately the Whig party, represented many of the views of the former Federalists, such as their advocacy of a tariff for the protection of manufactures, and of the expenditure of public money on internal improvements. It was willing to increase the army and navy, and like the Federalists found its chief though by no means its sole, support in the commercial and manufacturing parts of the country, that is to say, in New England and the middle States. Meantime a new question far more exciting, far more menacing, had arisen. In 1819 when Missouri applied to be admitted into the Union as a State, a sharp contest broke out in Congress as to whether slavery should be permitted within her limits, nearly all the Northern members voting against slavery, nearly all the Southern members for it. The struggle might have threatened the stability of the Union but for the compromise adopted next year, which, while admitting slavery in Missouri forbade it for the future north of lat. 36° 30′. The danger seemed to have passed, but in its very suddenness there had been something terrible. Jefferson, then over seventy, said that it startled him "like a fire-bell in the night." After 1845 things grew more serious, for whereas up till that time new States had been admitted substantially in pairs, a slave State balancing a free State, it began to be clear that this must shortly cease, since the remaining territory out of which new States would be formed lay north of the line 36° 30′. A

ry State held two seats in the Senate, the then existing ance in that chamber between slave States and free States, uld evidently soon be overset by the admission of a larger nber of the latter. The apprehension of this event, with probable result of legislation unfriendly to slavery, stimu- d the South to the annexation of Texas, and made them easingly sensitive to the growth, slow as that growth was, Abolitionist opinions at the North. The question of the ension of slavery west of the Missouri river had become 1850 the vital and absorbing question for the people of the ited States, and as in that year California, having organ- herself without slavery, was knocking at the doors of gress for admission as a State, it had become an urgent stion which evoked the hottest passions, and the victors in ch would be victors all along the line. But neither of the great parties ventured to commit itself either way. The thern Democrats hesitated to break with those Democrats he Northern States who sought to restrict slavery. The igs of the North, fearing to alienate their Southern allies ny decided action against the growing pretensions of the e-holders, temporized and suggested compromises which tically served the cause of slavery. Anxious to save at hazards the Union as it had hitherto stood, they did not eive that changes of circumstances and feeling were mak- this effort a hopeless one, and that in trying to keep their y together they were losing hold of the people, and alien- g from themselves the men who cared for principle in tics. That this was so presently appeared. The Demo- ic party had by 1852 passed almost completely under the rol of the slave-holders, and was adopting the dogma that gress enjoyed under the Constitution no power to prohibit ery in the territories. This dogma obviously overthrew nconstitutional the Missouri compromise of 1820. The g leaders discredited themselves by Henry Clay's com- nise scheme of 1850, which, while admitting California as e State, appeased the South by the Fugitive Slave Law. y received a crushing defeat at the presidential election of ; and what remained of their party finally broke in pieces 354 over the bill for organizing Kansas as a territory in h the question of slaves or no slaves should be left to the

people, a bill which of course repealed the Missouri compromise. Singularly enough, the two great orators of the party Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, both died in 1852, wearied with strife and disappointed in their ambition of reaching the presidential chair. Together with Calhoun, who passed away two years earlier, they are the ornaments of this generation not indeed rising to the stature of Washington or Hamilton but more remarkable than any, save one, among the statesmen who have followed them. With them ends the second period in the annals of American parties, which, extending from about 1820 to 1856, includes the rise and fall of the Whig party. Most of the controversies which filled it have become matter for history only. But three large results, besides the general democratization of politics, stand out. One is the detachment of the United States from the affairs of the Old World. Another is the growth of a sense of national life especially in the Northern and Western States, along with the growth at the same time of a secessionist spirit among the slave-holders. And the third is the development of the complex machinery of party organization, with the adoption of the principle on which that machinery so largely rests, that public office is to be enjoyed only by the adherents of the President for the time being.

The Whig party having begun to fall to pieces, the Democrats seemed to be for the moment, as they had been once before, left in possession of the field. But this time a new antagonist was swift to appear. The growing boldness of the slave-owners had already alarmed the Northern people when they were startled by a decision of the Supreme court, pronounced early in 1857 in the case of the slave Dred Scott, which laid down the doctrine that Congress had no power to forbid slavery anywhere, and that a slave-holder might carry his slaves with him whither he pleased, seeing that they were mere objects of property, whose possession the Constitution guaranteed.[1] This completed the formation out of the wrecks of the Whigs and Know-nothings or "American party," together with the Free Soilers and "Liberty" party of a new party, which in 1856 had run Fremont as its presidential candidate and taken the name of Repu

[1] This broad doctrine was not necessary for the decision of the case, b delivered as an *obiter dictum* by the majority of the court.

. At the same time an apple of discord was thrown among Democrats. In 1860 the latter could not agree upon a idate for President. The Southern wing pledged themes to one man, the Northern wing to another; a body of ating and semi-detached politicians put forward a third. s the Republicans through the divisions of their oppos triumphed in the election of Abraham Lincoln, presently wed by the secession of eleven slave States.

ne Republican party, which had started by proclaiming the of Congress to restrict slavery and had subsequently deced the Dred Scott decision, was of course throughout the War the defender of the Union and the assertor of Federal ority, stretched, as was unavoidable, to lengths previously ard of. When the war was over, there came the difficult of reconstructing the now reconquered slave States, and of ring the position in them of the lately liberated negroes. outrages perpetrated on the latter, and on white settlers in e parts of the South, required further exertions of Federal ority, and made the question of the limit of that authority a practical one, for the old Democratic party, almost ced during the war, had now reappeared in full force as dvocate of State rights, and the watchful critic of any e stretches of Federal authority. It was deemed necesto negative the Dred Scott decision and set at rest all ions relating to slavery and to the political equality of aces by the adoption of three important amendments ne Constitution. The troubles of the South by degrees ed down as the whites regained possession of the State rnments and the Northern troops began to be withdrawn. ne presidential election of 1876 the war question and o question had become dead issues, for it was plain that a and increasing number of the voters were no longer, te the appeals of the Republican leaders, seriously cond about them.

is election marks the close of the third period, which aces the rise and overwhelming predominance of the blican party. Formed to resist the extension of slavery, n to destroy it, compelled by circumstances to expand entral authority in a way unthought of before, that party ow worked out its programme and fulfilled its original

mission. The old aims were accomplished, but new ones had not yet been substituted, for though new problems had appeared, the party was not prepared with solutions. Similarly the Democratic party had discharged its mission in defending the rights of the reconstructed States, and criticising excesses of executive power; similarly it too had refused to grapple either with the fresh questions which had begun to arise since the war, or with those older questions which had now reappeared above the subsiding flood of war days. The old parties still stood as organizations, and still claimed to be the exponents of principles. Their respective principles had however, little direct application to the questions which confronted and divided the nation. A new era was opening which called either for the evolution of new parties, or for the transformation of the old ones by the adoption of tenets and the advocacy of views suited to the needs of the time. But this fourth period, which began with 1876, has not yet seen such a transformation, and we shall therefore find, when we come to examine the existing state of parties, that there is an unreality and lack of vital force in both Republicans and Democrats, powerful as their organizations are.

The foregoing sketch, given only for the sake of explaining the present condition of parties, suggests some observations on the foundations of party in America.

If we look over Europe we shall find that the grounds on which parties have been built and contests waged since the beginning of free governments have been in substance but few. In the hostility of rich and poor, or of capital and labour, in the fears of the Haves and the desires of the Have-nots, we perceive the most frequent ground, though it is often disguised as a dispute about the extension of the suffrage or some other civic right. Questions relating to the tenure of land have played a large part; so have questions of religion; so too have animosities or jealousies of race; and of course the form of government, whether it shall be a monarchy or a republic, has sometimes been in dispute. None of these grounds of quarrel substantially affected American parties during the three periods we have been examining. No one has ever advocated monarchy, or a restricted suffrage, or a unified instead of a Federal republic. Nor down to 1876 was there

r any party which could promise more to the poor than its ponents. In 1852 the Know-nothing party came forward the organ of native American opinion against recent immi- nts, then still chiefly the Irish, (though German immigra- n had begun to swell from 1849 onwards), and the not un- ural tendency to resent the power of foreign voters has netimes since appeared in various parts of the country. t as this 'American' party, for a time powerful by the ab- ption of many of the Whigs, failed to face the problem of very, and roused jealousy by its secret organization, it soon sed away, though it deserves to be remembered as a force integrating the then existing parties. The complete equal- of all sects, with the perfect neutrality of the government religious matters, has fortunately kept religious passion side the sphere of politics. The only exceptions to be ed are the occasionally recurring outbreaks, during the last ty years, of hostility to the Roman Catholic Church. Nor uld these outbreaks have attained political importance but the strength added to them by the feeling of the native inst the foreigner. They have been most serious at times en and in places where there has been an influx of immi- nts from Europe large enough to seem to threaten the minance of American ideas and the permanence of American itutions.

Have the American parties then been formed only upon nar- and local bases, have they contended for transient objects, can no deeper historical meaning, no longer historical tinuity, be claimed for them?

Two permanent oppositions may, I think, be discerned run- g through the history of the parties, sometimes openly ognized, sometimes concealed by the urgency of a transi- question. One of these is the opposition between a cen- ized or unitary and a federalized government. In every ntry there are centrifugal and centripetal forces at work, one or the other of which is for the moment the stronger. re has seldom been a country in which something might have been gained, in the way of good administration and nsive strength, by a greater concentration of power in the ds of the central government, enabling it to do things ch local bodies, or a more restricted central government,

could not do equally cheaply or well. Against this gain there is always to be set the danger that such concentration may weaken the vitality of local communities and authorities, and may enable the central power to stunt their development. Sometimes needs of the former kind are more urgent, or the sentiment of the people tends to magnify them; sometimes again the centrifugal forces obtain the upper hand. English history shows several such alternations. But in America the Federal form of government has made this permanent and natural opposition specially conspicuous. The salient feature of the Constitution is the effort it makes to establish an equipoise between the force which would carry the planet States off into space and the force which would draw them into the sun of the National government. There have always therefore been minds inclined to take sides upon this fundamental question, and a party has always had something definite and weighty to appeal to when it claims to represent either the autonomy of communities on the one hand, or the majesty and beneficent activity of the National government on the other. The former has been the watchword of the Democratic party. The latter was seldom distinctly avowed, but was generally in fact represented by the Federalists of the first period, the Whigs of the second, the Republicans of the third.

The other opposition, though it goes deeper and is more pervasive, has been less clearly marked in America, and less consciously admitted by the Americans themselves. It is the opposition between the tendency which makes some men prize the freedom of the individual as the first of social goods, and that which disposes others to insist on checking and regulating his impulses. The opposition of these two tendencies, the love of liberty and the love of order, is permanent and necessary, because it springs from differences in the intellect and feelings of men which one finds in all countries and at all epochs. There are always persons who are struck by the weakness of mankind, by their folly, their passion, their selfishness: and these persons, distrusting the action of average mankind, will always wish to see them guided by wise heads and restrained by strong hands. Such guidance seems the best means of progress, such restraint the only means of security. Those on the other hand who think better of human nature, and have more hope in their

rn tempers, hold the impulses of the average man to be gen-
ally towards justice and peace. They have faith in the
wer of reason to conquer ignorance, and of generosity to
erbear selfishness. They are therefore disposed to leave
e individual alone, and to entrust the masses with power.
very sensible man feels in himself the struggle between these
o tendencies, and is on his guard not to yield wholly to
her, because the one degenerates into tyranny, the other into
anarchy out of which tyranny will eventually spring. The
sest statesman is he who best holds the balance between
em.

Each of these tendencies found among the fathers of the
nerican Republic a brilliant and characteristic representative.
amilton, who had a low opinion of mankind, but a gift and a
ssion for large constructive statesmanship, went so far in his
vocacy of a strong government as to be suspected of wishing
establish a monarchy after the British pattern. He has left
record his opinion that the free constitution of England,
hich he admired in spite of the faults he clearly saw, could
t be worked without its corruptions.[1] Jefferson carried
rther than any other person set in an equally responsible place
s ever done, his faith that government is either needless or
evil, and that with enough liberty, everything will go well.
insurrection every few years, he said, must be looked for,
d even desired, to keep government in order. The Jeffer-
nian tendency has always remained, like a leaven, in the
mocratic party, though in applying Jeffersonian doctrines
e slave-holders stopped when they came to a black skin.
nong the Federalists, and their successors the Whigs, and
e more recent Republicans, there has never been wanting a
l faith in the power of freedom. The Republicans gave an
azing proof of it when they bestowed the suffrage on the
groes. Neither they nor any American party has ever pro-
sed itself the champion of authority and order. That would
a damaging profession. Nevertheless it is rather towards
at I may perhaps venture to call the Federalist-Whig-Re-
blican party than towards the Democrats that those who
ve valued the principle of authority have been generally

[1] David Hume had made the same remark, natural at a time when the
ver of Parliament was little checked by responsibility to the people.

drawn. It is for that party that the Puritan spirit, not extinct in America, has felt the greater affinity, for this spirit, having realized the sinfulness of human nature, is inclined to train and control the natural man by laws and force.

The tendency that makes for a strong government being akin to that which makes for a central government, the Federalist-Whig-Republican party, which has, through its long history, and under its varying forms and names, been the advocate of the national principle, found itself for this reason also led, more frequently than the Democrats, to exalt the rights and powers of government. It might be thought that the same cause would have made the Republican party take sides in that profound opposition which we perceive to-day in all civilized peoples, between the tendency to enlarge the sphere of legislation and State action, and the doctrine of *laissez faire*. So far, however, this has not happened. There is more in the character and temper of the Republicans than of the Democrats that leans towards State interference. But neither party has thought out the question; neither has shown any more definiteness of policy regarding it than the Tories and the Liberals have done in England.

American students of history may think that I have pressed the antithesis of liberty and authority, as well as that of centrifugal and centripetal tendencies, somewhat too far in making one party a representative of each through the first century of the Republic. I do not deny that at particular moments the party which was usually disposed towards a strong government resisted and decried authority, while the party which specially professed itself the advocate of liberty sought to make authority more stringent. Such deviations are however compatible with the general tendencies I have described. And no one who has gained even a slight knowledge of the history of the United States will fall into the error of supposing that the words Order and Authority mean there what they have meant in the monarchies of Continental Europe.

CHAPTER LIV

THE PARTIES OF TO-DAY

THERE are now two great and several minor parties in the nited States. The great parties are the Republicans and the emocrats. What are their principles, their distinctive tenets, eir tendencies? Which of them is for free trade, for civil rvice reform, for a spirited foreign policy, for the regulation telegraphs by legislation, for a national bankrupt law, for anges in the currency, for any other of the twenty issues hich one hears discussed in the country as seriously involv- g its welfare?

This is what a European is always asking of intelligent epublicans and intelligent Democrats. He is always asking ecause he never gets an answer. The replies leave him in eeper perplexity. After some months the truth begins to wn upon him. Neither party has anything definite to say these issues; neither party has any principles, any distinc- ve tenets. Both have traditions. Both claim to have ten- ncies. Both have certainly war cries, organizations, interests listed in their support. But those interests are in the main e interests of getting or keeping the patronage of the govern- ent. Tenets and policies, points of political doctrine and oints of political practice, have all but vanished. They have ot been thrown away but have been stripped away by Time d the progress of events, fulfilling some policies, blotting out hers. All has been lost, except office or the hope of it.

The phenomenon may be illustrated from the case of Eng- nd, where party government has existed longer and in a more lly developed form than in any other part of the Old World.[1]

[1] English parties are however not very ancient; they date only from the uggle of the Stuart kings with the Puritan and popular party in the House Commons, and did not take regular shape as Whigs and Tories till the reign Charles II.

The essence of the English parties has lain in the existence of two sets of views and tendencies which divide the nation into two sections, the party, let us say, though these general terms are not very safe, of movement and the party of standing still, the party of liberty and the party of order. Each section believes in its own views, and is influenced by its peculiar tendencies, recollections, mental associations, to deal in its own peculiar way with every new question as it comes up. The particular dogmas may change: doctrines once held by Whigs alone may now be held by Tories also; doctrines which Whigs would have rejected fifty years ago may now be part of the orthodox programme of the Liberal party. But the tendencies have been permanent and have always so worked upon the various fresh questions and problems which have presented themselves during the last two centuries, that each party has had not only a brilliant concrete life in its famous leaders and zealous members, but also an intellectual and moral life in its principles. These principles have meant something to those who held them, so that when a fresh question arose it was usually possible to predict how each party, how even the average members of each party, would regard and wish to deal with it. Thus even when the leaders have been least worthy and their aims least pure, an English party has felt itself ennobled and inspirited by the sense that it had great objects to fight for, a history and traditions which imposed on it the duty of battling for its distinctive principles. It is because issues have never been lacking which brought these respective principles into operation, forcing the one party to maintain the cause of order and existing institutions, the other that of freedom and what was deemed progress, that the two English parties have not degenerated into mere factions. Their struggles for office have been redeemed from selfishness by the feeling that office was a means of giving practical effect to their doctrines.

But suppose that in Britain all the questions which divide Tories from Liberals were to be suddenly settled and done with, Britain would be in a difficulty. Her free government has so long been worked by the action and reaction of the ministerialists and the opposition that there would probably continue to be two parties. But they would not be really, in the true old sense of the terms, Tories and Liberals; they would be merely

and Outs. Their combats would be waged hardly even in
ne for principles, but only for place. The government of
country, with the honour, power, and emoluments attached
t, would still remain as a prize to be contended for. The
owers would still rally to the leaders; and friendship would
bind the members together into organized bodies; while
ike and suspicion would still rouse them against their former
ersaries. Thus not only the leaders, who would have some-
ng tangible to gain, but even others who had only their feel-
s to gratify, would continue to form political clubs, register
ers, deliver party harangues, contest elections, just as they
now. The difference would be that each faction would no
ger have broad principles — I will not say to invoke, for
n principles would probably continue to be invoked as here-
re — but to insist on applying as distinctively its principles
ne actual needs of the state. Hence quiet or fastidious men
ld not join in party struggles; while those who did join
ld no longer be stimulated by the sense that they were con-
ling for something ideal. Loyalty to a leader whom it was
ght to make prime minister would be a poor substitute for
lty to a faith. If there were no conspicuous leader, at-
ment to the party would degenerate either into mere hatred
ntagonists or into a struggle over places and salaries. And
ost the same phenomena would be seen if, although the old
es had not been really determined, both the parties should
e so far abandoned their former positions that these issues
not divide them, so that each professed principles which
e, even if different in formal statement, practicably indis-
uishable in their application.

his, which conceivably may happen in England under her
political conditions, is what has happened with the Ameri-
parties. The chief practical issues which once divided
n have been settled. Some others have not been settled,
as regards these, one or other party has so departed from
ormer attitude that we cannot now speak of any conflict of
ciples.

hen life leaves an organic body it becomes useless, fetid,
ferous: it is fit to be cast out or buried from sight. What
s to an organism, principles are to a party. When they
h are its soul have vanished, its body ought to dissolve,

and the elements that formed it be regrouped in some new organism:

"The times have been
That when the brains were out the man would die."

But a party does not always thus die. It may hold together long after its moral life is extinct. Guelfs and Ghibellines warred in Italy for nearly two centuries after the Emperor had ceased to threaten the Pope, or the Pope to befriend the cities of Lombardy. Parties go on contending because their members have formed habits of joint action, and have contracted hatreds and prejudices, and also because the leaders find their advantage in using these habits and playing on these prejudices. The American parties now continue to exist, because they have existed. The mill has been constructed, and its machinery goes on turning, even when there is no grist to grind. But this is not wholly the fault of the men; for the system of government requires and implies parties, just as that of England does. These systems are made to be worked, and always have been worked, by a majority; a majority must be cohesive, gathered into a united and organized body: such a body is a party.

If you ask an ordinary Northern Democrat to characterize the two parties, he will tell you that the Republicans are corrupt and incapable, and will cite instances in which persons prominent in that party, or intimate friends of its leaders, have been concerned in frauds on the government or in disgraceful lobbying transactions in Congress. When you press him for some distinctive principles separating his own party from theirs, he will probably say that the Democrats are the protectors of States' rights and of local independence, and the Republicans hostile to both. If you go on to inquire what bearing this doctrine of States' rights has on any presently debated issue he will admit that, for the moment, it has none, but will insist that should any issue involving the rights of the States arise, his party will be, as always, the guardian of American freedom.

This is really all that can be predicated about the Democratic party. If a question involving the rights of a State against the Federal authority were to emerge, its instinct would lead it to array itself on the side of the State rather than of the central government, supposing that it had no direct motive to do

opposite. As it has at no point of time, from the outbreak
he war down to 1892, possessed a majority in both Houses
ongress as well as the President in power, its devotion to
principle has not been tested, and might not resist the
ptation of any interest the other way. However, this is
ter of speculation, for at present the States fear no infringe-
t of their rights. So conversely of the Republicans. Their
itions ought to dispose them to support Federal power
nst the States, but their action in a concrete case would
ably depend on whether their party was at the time in
lition to use that power for its own purposes. If they
e in a minority in Congress, they would be little inclined
rengthen Congress against the States. The simplest way
roving or illustrating this will be to run quickly through
questions of present practical interest.

hat which most keenly interests the people, though of
se not all the people, is the regulation or extinction of the
or traffic. On this neither party has committed or will
nit itself. The traditional dogmas of neither cover it,
gh the Democrats have been rather more disposed to leave
to themselves than the Republicans, and rather less amen-
to the influence of ethical sentiment. Practically for
parties the point of consequence is what they can gain
se. Each has clearly something to lose. The drink-
part of the population is chiefly foreign. Now the
are mainly Democrats, so the Democratic party dare
offend them. The Germans are mainly Republican, so
Republicans are equally bound over to caution. It is
that though the parties, as parties, have been, in nearly
tates, neutral, most Temperance men are, in the North
West,[1] Republicans, most whiskey-men and saloon-keepers
ocrats. The Republicans therefore more frequently at-
t to conciliate the anti-liquor party by flattering phrases.
suffer by the starting of a Prohibitionist candidate, since

[1] The Southern negroes have usually voted for the Republicans, but are
ally opposed to restrictions on the sale of liquor. This was strikingly
in a recent popular vote on the subject in Texas. On the other hand,
tter class of Southern whites, who are of course Democrats, are largely
erance men, and some States, *e.g.* Georgia, have adopted a local option
n, under which each county decides whether it will be "wet" or "dry"
ermit or forbid the sale of intoxicants).

he draws more voting strength away from them than he does from the Democrats.

Free Trade *v.* Protection is another burning question, and has been so since the early days of the Union. The old controversy as to the constitutional right of Congress to impose a tariff for any object but that of raising revenue, has been laid to rest, for whether the people in 1788 meant or did not mean to confer such a power, it has been exerted for so many years, and on so superb a scale, that no one now doubts its legality. Before the war the Democrats were advocates of a tariff for revenue only, *i.e.* of Free Trade. Some of them still hold that doctrine in its fulness, but as the majority, though they favour a reduction of the present system of import duties, have not been clear upon the general principle, the party trumpet has often given an uncertain sound. Moreover, Pennsylvania is Protectionist on account of its iron industries; northern Georgia and Alabama and South-eastern Tennessee have leanings that way for the same reason; Louisiana has sometimes inclined to Protection on account of its sugar. Unwilling to alienate the Democrats of three such districts, the party has generally sought to remain unpledged, or, at least, in winking with one eye to the men of the North-West and South-East who desire to reduce the tariff, it has been tempted to wink with the other to the iron men of Pittsburg and the sugar men of New Orleans. Thus, though the Democrats have come to advocate more and more strongly large changes in the present system, they have done this not so much on pure Free Trade principles, as on the ground that the surplus must be got rid of, and that the duties now in force oppress many classes in the community. The surplus has now (1894) disappeared, eaten up by the Pension Act of 1890, and has been replaced by a deficit, but the Democrats committed themselves against Protection in the election of 1892 more distinctly than they had previously done. The Republicans, all along bolder, have twice pledged themselves, in framing their platform, to maintain the protective tariff. But some of the keenest intellects in their ranks, including a few leading journalists, have been strong for Free Trade and therefore sorely tempted to break with their party. Only a few, however, have on that ground forsaken it.

vil service reform, whereof more hereafter, has for some past received the lip service of both parties, a lip service essed by both with equal warmth, and by the average pro- onal politicians of both with equal insincerity. Such ms as have been effected in the mode of filling up places, been forced on the parties by public opinion, rather than ed through by either. None of the changes made — and are perhaps the most beneficial of recent changes — has d an issue between the parties, or given either of them a on the confidence of the country. The best men in both es support the Civil Service Commission; the worst men th would gladly get rid of it.

e advantages of regulating, by Federal legislation, rail- and telegraphic lines extending over a number of States, ubject frequently discussed. Neither party has had any- distinctive to say upon it in the way either of advocacy condemnation. Both have asserted that it is the duty of ays to serve the people, and not to tyrannize over or de- them, so the Inter-State Commerce Act passed in 1887 this view cannot be called a party measure. Finances on the whole been well managed, and debt paid off with ising speed. But there have been, and are still, serious ems raised by the condition of the currency. Both parties made mistakes, and mistakes about equally culpable, for gh the Republicans, having more frequently commanded gressional majority, have had superior opportunities for ering, the Democrats have once or twice more definitely itted themselves to pernicious doctrines. Neither party proposes a clear and definite policy, although the Demo- have been more inclined to the free coinage of silver.

s the same as regards minor questions, such as woman ge or ballot reform, or convict labour. Neither party ny distinctive attitude on these matters; neither is more , or less likely, than the other to pass a measure dealing hem. It is the same with regard to the doctrine of *laissez* as opposed to governmental interference. Neither Repub- nor Democrats can be said to be friends or foes of State erence: each will advocate it when there seems a prac- useful object to be secured, or when the popular voice to call for it. It is the same with foreign policy. Both

parties are practically agreed not only as to the general princ
ples which ought to rule the conduct of the country, but as
the application of these principles. The party which oppos
the President may at any given moment seek to damage hi
by defeating some particular proposal he has made, but this
will do as a piece of temporary strategy, not in pursuance
any settled doctrine.

Yet one cannot say that there is to-day no difference b
tween the two great parties. There is a difference of spi
or sentiment perceptible even by a stranger when, after havi
mixed for some time with members of the one he begins
mix with those of the other, and doubtless much more pate
to a native American. It resembles (though it is less mark
than) the difference of tone and temper between Tories a
Liberals in England. The intellectual view of a Democrat
the better sort is not quite the same as that of his Republic
compeer: neither is his ethical standard. Each of course thin
meanly of the other; but while the Democrat thinks the Repu
lican "dangerous" (*i.e.* likely to undermine the Constitutio
the Republican is more apt to think the Democrat vicious a
reckless. So in England your Liberal fastens on stupidity
the characteristic fault of the Tory, while the Tory suspec
the morals and religion more than he despises the intelligen
of the Radical.

It cannot be charged on the American parties that th
have drawn towards one another by forsaking their old pri
ciples. It is time that has changed the circumstances of t
country, and made those old principles inapplicable. Th
would seem to have erred rather by clinging too long to o
worn issues, and by neglecting to discover and work out ne
principles capable of solving the problems which now perpl
the country. In a country so full of change and movement
America new questions are always coming up, and must
answered. New troubles surround a government, and a w
must be found to escape from them; new diseases attack t
nation, and have to be cured. The duty of a great party is
face these, to find answers and remedies, applying to the fa
of the hour the doctrines it has lived by, so far as they
still applicable, and when they have ceased to be applicab
thinking out new doctrines conformable to the main princip

endencies which it represents. This is a work to be
nplished by its ruling minds, while the habit of party
y to the leaders powerfully serves to diffuse through the
of followers the conclusions of the leaders and the rea-
gs they have employed.

ut," the European reader may ask, "is it not the inter-
well as the duty of a party thus to adapt itself to new
tions? Does it not, in failing to do so, condemn itself to
ity and impotence, ultimately, indeed, to supersession by
new party which the needs of the time have created?"
s is what usually happens in Europe. Probably it will
n in the long run in America also, unless the parties
themselves to the new issues, just as the Whig party fell
52–57 because it failed to face the problem of slavery.
it happens more slowly may be ascribed partly to the
leteness and strength of the party organizations, which
the enthusiasm generated by ideas less necessary, partly
e growing prominence of 'social' and 'labour' questions,
hich both parties are equally eager to conciliate the
s, and equally unwilling to proclaim definite views,
to the fact that several questions on which the two
parties still hesitate to take sides are not presently vital
well-being of the country. Something is also due to the
er influence in America than in Europe of individual
s. English parties, which hesitate long over secondary
ions, might hesitate longer than is now their practice
vital ones also, were they not accustomed to look for
nce to their chiefs, and to defer to the opinion which the
deliver. And it is only by courage and the capacity for
ive that the chiefs themselves retain their position.

CHAPTER LV

COMPOSITION OF THE PARTIES

The less there is in the tenets of the Republicans and Dem crats to make their character intelligible to a European read so much the more desirable is it to convey some idea of wh may be called their social and local, their racial and ecclesias cal complexions.

The Republican party was formed between 1854 and 18 chiefly out of the wrecks of the Whig party, with the additi of the Abolitionists and Free Soilers, who, disgusted at t apparent subservience to the South of the leading northe Whigs, had for some time previously acted as a group by the selves, though some of them had been apt to vote for Whig c didates. They had also recruits from the Free Soil Democra who had severed themselves from the bulk of the Democra party, and some of whom claimed to be true Jeffersonians joining the party which stood up against the spread of slaver The Republicans were therefore from the first a Northe party, more distinctly so than the Federalists had been at t close of the preceding century, and much more distinctly than the Whigs, in whom there had been a pretty stro Southern element.

The Whig element brought to the new party solidity, pol cal experience, and a large number of wealthy and influent adherents. The Abolitionist element gave it force and ent siasm, qualities invaluable for the crisis which came in 18 with the secession of all save four of the slave-holding Stat During the war, it drew to itself nearly all the earnestne patriotism, religious and moral fervour, which the North a

[1] The name Republican was given to the new party, not without the l of thereby making it easier for these old school Democrats to join it, fo Jefferson's day his party had been called Republican.

t contained. It is still, in those regions, the party in se ranks respectable, steady, pious, well-conducted men are e looked for. If you find yourself dining with one of "the people" in any New England city, or in Philadelphia, or incinnati, Cleveland, Chicago, or Minneapolis, you assume the guest sitting next you is a Republican, almost as con-ntly as in English county society you would assume your hbour to be a Tory; that is to say, you may sometimes be ng, but in four cases out of five you will be right. In New k the presumption is weaker, though even there you will ight three times out of five. One may say that all over North, the merchants, manufacturers, and professional men ne smaller perhaps even more than of the larger towns, to be Republicans. So too are the farmers, particularly ne North-west.[1] The working class in the cities is divided, the more solid part of it, the church-goers and total ab-ners, are generally Republicans. A number, still large, gh of course daily diminishing, are soldiers of the Civil ; and these naturally rally to the old flag. When turn-southwards one reaches the borders of the old slave States, ything is changed. In Baltimore the best people are so rally Democrats that when you meet a Republican in ty you ask whether he is not an immigrant from New and. This is less marked by the case in Kentucky and ouri, but in Virginia, or the Carolinas, or the Gulf States, few men of good standing belong to the Republican party, h consists of the lately enfranchised negroes, of a certain ber of native whites, seldom well regarded, who organize use the negro vote, and who twenty-five years ago were ng a good thing for themselves out of it; of a number ederal officials (a number very small when the Democrats n power), who have been put into Federal places by their ds at Washington, on the understanding that they are to for the party, and of a few stray people, perhaps settlers the North who have not yet renounced their old affilia-. It is not easy for an educated man to remain a Repub-in the South, not only because the people he meets in

[1] his statement, written in 1888, is now less true, for both the Democrats e so-called 'People's Party' have gained strength in the North-western since that date.

society are Democrats, but because the Republican party m
agers are apt to be black sheep.

In the Middle States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvan
to which one may for this purpose add Ohio and Indiana, a
on the Pacific slope, the parties are nearly balanced, and
majority of votes sways now this way now that, as the circu
stances of the hour, or local causes, or the merits of individ
candidates, may affect the popular mind. Pennsylvania,
instance, is now, as she has been since 1860, a Republi
State, owing to her interest in a protective tariff. New Yo
whose legislature is frequently Republican, in presidential el
tions generally goes Democratic. In these doubtful Sta
the better sort of people have been mostly Republicans. I
in that party you look to find the greater number of the phil
thropists, the men of culture, the men of substance who des
to see things go on quietly, with no shocks given to busin
confidence by rash legislation. These are great elements
strength. They were gained for the Republican party by
earlier history, which drew into it thirty years ago those pa
otic and earnest young men who are now the leading elde
men in their respective neighbourhoods. But against th
must be set the tendency of a section of the Republican pa
a section small in numbers but including some men of cha
ter and intelligence, to break away, or, as it is called, "bo
from the party platform and "ticket." This section expla
its conduct by declaring that the great claims which the pa
gained on the confidence of the country by its resistance
slavery and its vigorous prosecution of the war have been
feited by mal-administration since the war ended, and by
scandals which have gathered round some of its conspicu
figures. If intelligence and cultivation dispose their pos
sors to desert at a critical moment, the party might be stron
without this element, for, as everybody knows, a good pa
man is he who stands by his friends when they are wrong.

The Democratic party suffers in the North and West f
exactly the opposite causes to the Republican. It was l
discredited by its sympathy with the South, and by the op
sition of a considerable section within it (the so-called Cop
heads) to the prosecution of the war. This shadow hung he
over it till the complete pacification of the South and grow

minence of new questions began to call men's minds away
n the war years. From 1869 to 1885 it profited from being
pposition. Saved from the opportunity of abusing patron-
or becoming complicated in administration jobs, it was
to criticize freely the blunders or vices of its opponents.
ay however be doubted whether its party managers have
, take them all in all, either wiser or purer than those
m they criticized, nor do they seem to have inspired any
er trust in the minds of impartial citizens. When, as has
ral times happened, the Democrats have obtained a major-
n the House of Representatives, their legislation has not
higher in aim or more judicious in the choice of means
that which Republican congresses have produced. Hence
tendency to desert from the Republican ranks has enured
he benefit of the Democrats less than might have been
ected. However, the Democratic party includes not only
ly all the talent, education, and wealth of the South, to-
er with the great bulk of the Southern farmers and poor
es, but also a respectable and apparently increasing minority
ood men in the Middle States, and a somewhat smaller
rity in New England and the North-west.[1]
these last-mentioned districts its strength lies chiefly in
ities, a curious contrast to those earlier days when Jeffer-
was supported by the farmers and Hamilton by the towns-
[2] But the large cities have now a population unlike
hing that existed eighty years ago, a vast ignorant fluc-
ng mass of people, many of them recently admitted to
enship, who have little reason for belonging to one party
er than another, but are attracted some by the name of the
ocratic party, some by the fact that it is not the party of
well-to-do, some by leaders belonging to their own races
have risen to influence in its ranks. The adhesion of
mob gives the party a slight flavour of rowdyism, as its
ssociations give it, to a Puritan palate, a slight flavour of

1892, however, several North-western States were carried by the Dem-
.

efferson regarded agriculture as so much the best occupation for citizens
e was alarmed by the rumour that the codfish of the North-eastern coasts
coming down to the shores of Virginia and Carolina, lest the people of
States should "be tempted to catch them, and commerce, of which we
already too much, receive an accession."

irreligion. Twenty years ago, a New England deacon — the deacon is in America the type of solid respectability — would have found it as hard to vote for a Democratic candidate as an English archdeacon to vote for a Birmingham Radical. But these old feelings are wearing away. A new generation of voters has arisen which never saw slavery, and cares little about Jefferson for good or for evil. This generation takes parties as it finds them. Even among the older voters there has been a change within the last ten years. Many of the best Republicans, who remembered the Democrats as the party of which a strong section sympathized with the slaveholders before the war, and disapproved of the war while it was being waged, looked with horror on the advent to power in 1885 of a Democratic president. The country, however, was not ruined by Mr. Cleveland, but went on much as before, its elements of good and evil mixed and contending, just as under Republican administrations. However, the Republican leaders still point to the fact that the Democratic party commands the solid vote of the States where slavery formerly existed as a reason why it should excite the distrust of good citizens who fought for the Union.

Now that differences of political doctrine are not accentuated, race differences play a considerable part in the composition of the parties. Besides the native Americans, there are men of five nationalities in the United States — British, Irish, Germans, Scandinavians, French Canadians.[1] Of these, however, the English and Scotch lose their identity almost immediately, being absorbed into the general mass of native citizens. Though very numerous, they have hitherto counted for nothing politically, because they have either been indifferent to political struggles or have voted from the same motives as an average American. They have to a large extent remained British subjects, not caring for the suffrage. Recently, however, an effort has been made (apparently chiefly for the sake of counterworking the Irish) to induce them to apply for citizenship and exert their voting power as a united body. It may be doubted

[1] There are also Poles, Czechs, Italians, Russian Jews, and Slavs from Hungary (as well as a few Roumans and Armenians): but their number, though it has increased rapidly of late years, is relatively small, except in two or three of the Atlantic cities, in Chicago, Milwaukee, Cleveland, St. Paul, Minneapolis, New Orleans, and in the mining regions of Pennsylvania.

hether they will become citizens to any great extent, or hether, if they do, they will cast a solid vote.

Far otherwise with the Irish. They retain their national pirit and disposition to act together into the second, rarely owever into the third, generation; they are a factor potent Federal and still more potent in city politics. Now the ish have hitherto been nearly all Democrats. The exodus om Ireland which had been considerable as far back as 1842, velled in 1847 (the year after the famine) to vast proportions; nd was from the first a source of help to the Democratic party, robably because it was less Protestant in sentiment than the Vhig party, and was already dominant in the city of New York, here the Irish first became a power in politics. The aversion the negro which they soon developed, made them, when the epublican party arose, its natural enemies, for the Republi- ns were, both during and after the war, the negro's patrons. efore the war ended the Irish vote had come to form a large art of the Democratic strength, and Irishmen were prominent nong the politicians of that party: hence newcomers from eland have generally enlisted under its banner. To-day, owever, there are plenty of Irishmen, and indeed of Irish aders and bosses, among the Republicans of the great cities; nd statesmen of that party often seek to "placate" and tract the Irish vote in ways too familiar to need description.

The German immigration, excluding of course the early erman settlements in Pennsylvania, began rather later than e Irish; and as there is some jealousy between the two ces, the fact that the Irish were already Democrats when e Germans arrived, was one reason why the latter have en more inclined to enrol themselves as Republicans, while other is to be found in the fact that German exiles of 1849 ere naturally hostile to slavery. The Germans usually be- me farmers in the Middle and Western States, where, find- g the native farmers mainly Republicans, they imitate the litics of their neighbours. That there are many German emocrats in the great cities may be ascribed to the less endly attitude of the Republicans to the liquor traffic, for e German colonist is faithful to the beer of his fatherland, d, in the case of the Roman Catholic Germans, to the tacit iance which has subsisted in many districts between the

Catholic Church and the Democrats. The Germans are a cohesive race, keeping up national sentiment by festivals, gymnastic societies, processions, and national songs, but as they take much less keenly to politics, and are not kept together by priests, their cohesion is more short-lived than that of the Irish. The American-born son of a German is already completely an American in feeling as well as in practical aptitude. The German vote over the whole Union may be roughly estimated as five-ninths Republican, four-ninths Democratic.

The Scandinavians — Swedes and Norwegians, with a few Danes and a handful of Icelanders — now form a respectable element among the farmers of the Upper Mississippi States, particularly Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Dakotas. So far as can be judged from the short experience the country has of them, for it is scarce thirty years since their immigration began, they Americanize even more readily than their Teutonic cousins from the southern side of the Baltic. However, both Swedes and Norwegians are still so far clannish that in these States both parties find it worth while to run for office now and then a candidate of one or other, or candidates of both, of these nationalities, in order to catch the votes of his or their compatriots.[1] Nine-tenths of them were Republicans, until the rise of the so-called "People's Party," which has for the moment detached a good many. Like the Germans, they come knowing nothing of American politics, but the watchful energy of the native party-workers enlists them under a party banner as soon as they are admitted to civic rights. They make perhaps the best material for sober and industrious agriculturists that America receives, being even readier than the Germans to face hardship, and more content to dispense with alcoholic drinks.

The French Canadians are numerous in New England, and in one or two other Northern States, yet scarcely numerous enough to tell upon politics, especially as they frequently remain British subjects. Their religion disposes those who become citizens to side with the Democratic party, but the

[1] There is some slight jealousy between Swedes and Norwegians, so that where they are equally strong it is not safe to put forward a candidate of either race without placing on the same ticket a candidate of the other also. But where the population of either race is too small to support a church or social institution of its own, they fraternize for this purpose, feeling themselves much nearer to one another than they are to any other element.

e only beginning to constitute what is called "a vote," and casionally "go Republican."

The negroes in the Northern, Middle, and Pacific States are unimportant element. Gratitude for the favour shown to eir race has kept them mostly Republicans. They are seldom mitted to a leading place in party organizations, but it is und expedient in presidential contests to organize a "coloured b" to work for the candidate among the coloured population a town. In States like Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, ere there are plenty of white Republicans, they vote steadily publican, unless paid to abstain. In the further South, eir mere numbers would enable them, were they equal to e whites in intelligence, wealth, and organization, not merely carry congressional seats, but even in some States to deter-ne a presidential election. But in these three respects they e unspeakably inferior. At first, under the leadership of some ite adventurers, mostly of the "carpet-bagger" class, they nt almost solid for the Republican party; and occasionally, en since the withdrawal of Federal troops, they have turned e balance in its favour. Now, however, the Democrats have npletely gained the upper hand; and the negroes, perhaps ing faith in their former bosses, perhaps discouraged by ing themselves unfit to cope with a superior race, perhaps s interested than at first in their new privileges, have begun lose their solidarity. A few now vote with the Democrats.

Religion comes very little into American party except when, sometimes happens, the advance of the Roman Catholic urch and the idea that she exerts her influence to secure efits for herself, causes an outburst of Protestant feeling.[1] man Catholics are usually Democrats, because, except in ryland, which is Democratic anyhow, they are mainly Irish. ngregationalists and Unitarians, being presumably sprung m New England, are apt to be Republicans. Presbyterians, thodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, have no special party affin-s. They are mostly Republicans in the North, Democrats the South. The Mormons fight for their own hand, and in ah, Idaho, and Arizona have been wont to cast their votes, der the direction of their hierarchy, for the local party which

[1] As recently in the formation of the American Protective Association, which become a political factor in parts of the North-west.

promised to interfere least with them. Lately in Idaho a party found it worth while to run a Mormon candidate.

The distribution of parties is to some extent geographical. While the South casts a solid Democratic vote, and the strength of the Republicans has lain in the North-east and North-west, the intermediate position of the Middle States corresponds to their divided political tendencies. The reason is that in America colonization has gone on along parallels of latitude. The tendencies of New England reappear in Northern Ohio, Northern Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, giving the Republicans a general predominance in this vast and swiftly-growing Western population, which it takes the whole weight of the solid South to balance. This geographical opposition does not, however, betoken a danger of political severance. The material interests of the agriculturists of the North-west are not different from those of the South: free trade, for instance, will make as much and no more difference to the wheat-grower of Illinois as to the cotton-grower of Texas, to the iron-workers of Tennessee as to the iron-workers of Pennsylvania. And the existence of an active Democratic party in the North prevents the victory of either geographical section from being felt as a defeat by the other.

This is an important security against disruption. And a similar security against the risk of civil strife or revolution is to be found in the fact that the parties are not based on or sensibly affected by differences either of wealth or of social position. Their cleavage is not horizontal according to social strata, but vertical. This would be less true if it were stated either of the Northern States separately, or of the Southern States separately: it is true of the Union taken as a whole. It might cease to be true if the new labour party were to grow till it absorbed or superseded either of the existing parties. The same feature has characterized English politics as compared with those of most European countries, and has been a main cause of the stability of the English government and of the good feeling between different classes in the community.[1]

[1] At the present moment the vast majority of the rich, a proportion probably larger than at any previous time, belong in England to one of the two historic parties. But this phenomenon may possibly pass away.

CHAPTER LVI

FURTHER OBSERVATIONS ON THE PARTIES

Besides the two great parties which have divided America for thirty years, there are two or three lesser organizations or factions needing a word of mention. Between sixty and seventy years ago there was a period when one of the two great parties having melted away, the other had become split up into minor sections.[1] Parties were numerous and unstable, new ones forming, and after a short career uniting with some other, or vanishing altogether from the scene. This was a phenomenon peculiar to that time, and ceased with the building up about 1832 of the Whig party, which lasted till shortly before the Civil War. But Tocqueville, who visited America in 1831–32, took it for the normal state of a democratic community, and founded upon it some bold generalizations. A stranger who sees how few principles now exist to hold each of the two great modern parties together will be rather surprised that they have not shown more tendency to split up into minor groups and factions.

What constitutes a party? In America there is a simple test. Any section of men who nominate candidates of their own for the presidency and vice-presidency of the United States are deemed a national party. Adopting this test we shall find that there have lately been two or three national parties in addition to the Republicans and Democrats.

The first is (or rather was) that of the Greenbackers, who arose soon after the end of the Civil War. They demanded a large issue of greenbacks (*i.e.* paper money, so called from the colour of the notes issued during the war), alleging that this must benefit the poorer classes, who will obviously be

[1] The same phenomenon reappeared at the break-up of the Whigs between 1854 and 1857, and from much the same cause.

richer when there is more money in the country. It may seem incredible that there should still be masses of civilized men who believe that money is value, and that a liberal issue of stamped paper can give the poor more bread or better clothes. If there were a large class of debtors, and the idea was to depreciate the currency and let them then pay their debts in it, one could understand the proposal. Such a depreciation existed during and immediately after the Civil War. As wages and prices had risen enormously, people were receiving more money in wages, or for goods sold, than they had received previously, while they were paying fixed charges, such as interest on mortgage debts, in a depreciated paper currency. Thus the small farmers were on the whole gainers, while creditors and persons with fixed incomes were losers. It is true that both farmers and working men were also paying more for whatever they needed, food, clothes, and lodging; still they seemed to have felt more benefit in receiving larger sums than they felt hardship in paying out larger sums. Those who now call for a great increase of paper money do not profess to wish to depreciate the currency: nor have they been to any great extent supported by a debtor class to which a depreciated currency would be welcome, as a debased coinage served the momentary occasions of mediæval kings. But the recollections of the war time with its abundant employment and high wages cling to many people, and are coupled with a confused notion that the more money there is in circulation so much the more of it will everybody have, so much the better off will he be, so much the more employment will capital find for labour, and so much the more copious will be the fertilizing stream of wages diffused among the poor.[1]

The Greenback party, which at first called itself Independent, held a national Nominating Convention in 1876, at which nineteen States were represented, and nominated candidates for president and vice-president, issuing an emphatic but ungrammatical denunciation of the financial policy of the Republican and Democratic parties. They again put forward

[1] The matter is further complicated by the fact that the national bank-notes issued by the national banks are guaranteed by government bonds deposited with the U. S. treasury, bonds on which the national government pays interest. The Greenbackers desired to substitute greenbacks, or so-called "fiat money," for these bank-notes as a circulating medium.

ıdidates in 1880 and 1884, but made a poor show in the vot- in most States, and of course came nowhere within a meas- ble distance of carrying a State.

The Labour party has of late years practically superseded Greenbackers, and seems to have now drawn to itself such nerents as that party retained. It is not easy to describe its cise tenets, for it includes persons of very various views, ne who would be called in Europe pronounced socialists or mmunists, others who wish to restrain the action of railway l telegraph companies and other so-called "monopolists," l of course many who, while dissatisfied with existing eco- nic conditions, and desiring to see the working classes receive rger share of the good things of the world, are not prepared say in what way these conditions can be mended and this ılt attained. Speaking generally, the reforms advocated by leaders of the Labour party include the "nationalization of land," the imposition of a progressive income tax,[1] the tak- over of railroads and telegraphs by the National government, prevention of the immigration of Chinese and of any other ign labourers who may come under contract, the restriction ll so-called monopolies, the forfeiture of railroad land grants, increase of the currency, the free issue of inconvertible er, and, above all, the statutory restriction of hours of our. But it must not be supposed that all the leaders adopt hese tenets; and the party is still too young to make it to say who are to be deemed its leaders. It shows a dency to split up into factions. Its strength has lain in trade unions of the operative class, and particularly in the rmous organization or league of trade unions known as the ghts of Labour: and it is therefore warmly interested in administration of the various State laws which affect strikes the practice of boycotting by which strikes often seek to vail. Besides the enrolled Knights, whose political strength ss feared now than it was some years ago, it has much support n the recent immigrants who fill the great cities, especially Germans, Poles, Czechs and other Austro-Hungarian Slavs.

[1] This was demanded by the Greenback national convention in its platforms 80 and 1884, and by the Farmers' Alliance in 1890; but less than might be cted has been heard of it in America. Its adoption in the Canton of Vaud itzerland caused some of the wealthier inhabitants to quit the canton.

The Labour party did not run a presidential candidate till 1888, and was then divided, so that its strength could not be well estimated. But it has been wont to put forward candidates in State and city elections when it saw a chance. It ran Mr. Henry George for Mayor of New York City in 1886, and obtained the unexpected success of polling 67,000 votes against 90,000 given to the regular Democratic, and 60,000 to the regular Republican candidate;[1] but this success was not sustained in the contest for the Secretaryship of the State of New York in 1887, when a vote of only 37,000 was cast by the Labour party in the city. In 1892 one section, calling itself the Socialist Labour Party, ran a presidential candidate, but obtained only 21,164 votes, 17,956 of which came from New York, the rest from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. At present it is a somewhat incalculable force in State and local politics, nowhere strong enough to carry its own candidates, but sometimes able to defeat one of the regular parties by drawing away a part of its voters, or to extort a share of the offices for some of its nominees. It is only in some States, chiefly Northern States, that Labour candidates are run at all.

The Prohibitionists, or opponents of the sale of intoxicating liquors, have since 1872 regularly held a national convention for the nomination of a presidential candidate, and put out a ticket, *i.e.* nominated candidates for president and vice-president. The action of this party has been most frequent in the State legislatures, because the whole question of permitting, restricting, or abolishing the sale of intoxicants is a matter for the States and not for Congress. However, the Federal government raises a large revenue by its high import duty on wines, spirits, and malt liquors, and also levies an internal excise. As this revenue was for some years before 1890 no longer needed for the expenses of the National government, it was proposed to distribute it among the States, or apply it to some new and useful purpose, or to reduce both customs duties and the excise. The fear of the first or second of these courses, which would give the manufacture and sale of intoxicants a new lease of life, or of the third, which would greatly increase their consumption, was among the causes which

[1] In 1874 when a Labour candidate was first run for the New York mayoralty he obtained only between 3000 and 4000 votes.

uced the Prohibitionists to enter the arena of national pol-
; and they further justify their conduct in doing so by
posing to amend the Federal Constitution for the purposes
rohibition, and to stop the sale of intoxicants in the Terri-
es and in the District of Columbia, which are under the
ct control of Congress.[1] Their running a candidate for the
idency is more a demonstration than anything else, as
have a comparatively weak vote to cast, many even of
e who sympathize with them preferring to support one
ther of the great parties rather than throw away a vote
he abstract assertion of a principle. One ought indeed
istinguish between the Prohibitionists proper, who wish
top the sale of intoxicants altogether, and the Temperance
, who are very numerous among Republicans in the North
Democrats in the South, and who, while ready to vote for
al Option and a High Licence Law, disapprove the attempt
mpose absolute prohibition by general legislation.[2] The

[1] The Prohibitionist platform of 1884, issued by their national convention, ained the following passage:—
Congress should exercise its undoubted power and prohibit the manufact-nd sale of intoxicating beverages in the District of Columbia, in the Ter-es of the United States, and in all places over which the Government has sive jurisdiction; that hereafter no State shall be admitted to the Union its Constitution shall expressly prohibit polygamy and the manufacture ale of intoxicating beverages." In 1892 their platform ran thus: "The r traffic is a foe to civilization, the arch enemy of popular government, public nuisance. It is the citadel of the forces that corrupt politics, pro-poverty and crime, degrade the nation's home life, thwart the will of the e, and deliver our country into the hands of rapacious class interests. ws that under the guise of regulation legalize and protect this traffic, or the government share in its ill-gotten gains, are 'vicious in principle and rless as a remedy.' We declare anew for the entire suppression of the facture, sale, importation, exportation, and transportation of alcoholic rs as a beverage by Federal and State legislation, and the full powers of overnment should be exerted to secure this result."

[2] e might have expected the Prohibitionists to advocate the repeal of the ctive tariff on manufactured goods so as to make it necessary to main-customs duties and an excise on intoxicants for the purposes of the Na-l government. But this would imply that these beverages might still be med, which is just what the more ardent spirits in the temperance party e to contemplate. In 1892 they said: "Tariff should be levied only as a ce against foreign governments which lay tariff upon or bar out our cts from their markets, revenue being incidental."
Many State legislatures have "placated" the Temperance men by enacting 'the hygienics of alcohol and its action upon the human body" shall be ular subject of instruction in the public schools. Whether this instruction

number of persons who are thorough-going Prohibitionists and pure Prohibitionists, that is to say, who are not also Republicans or Democrats, is small, far too small, even when reinforced by a section of the "Temperance men," and by discontented Republicans or Democrats who may dislike the "regular" candidates of their party, to give the Prohibition ticket a chance of success in any State. The importance of the ticket lies in the fact that in a doubtful State it may draw away enough votes from one of the "regular" candidates to leave him in a minority. Mr. Blaine probably suffered in this way in the election of 1884, most of the votes cast for the Prohibitionist candidate having come from quondam Republicans. On the other hand, a case may be imagined in which the existence of an outlet or safety-valve, such as a Prohibitionist ticket, would prevent the "bolters" from one party from taking the more dangerous course of voting for the candidate of the opposite party.[1]

The strength of the Prohibitionist party lies in the religious and moral earnestness which animates it and makes it for many purposes the successor and representative of the Abolitionists of forty years ago. Clergymen are prominent in its conventions, and women take an active part in its work. Partly from its traditions and temper, partly because it believes that women would be on its side in elections, it advocates the extension to them of the electoral franchise.

A spirit of discontent with the old parties, and vague wish to better by legislation the condition of the agriculturists, has caused the growth of what was called at first the Farmers' Alliance Party, but now the People's Party, or "Populists," which in 1889 and 1890 rose suddenly to importance in the West and South, and secured some seats from Western States in the Fifty-second and again in the Fifty-third Congress. Its platform agrees in several points with those of the Greenbackers and Labour men, but instead of seeking to "nationalize" the land it desires to reduce the taxation on real estate and to secure (among other benefits) loans from the public treasury

does more good or harm is a controverted point, as to which see the report for 1890 of the U. S. Commissioner of Education.

[1] The Prohibitionist Convention of 1888 was attended by a good many persons desiring to form a new Third Party, of which the regulation of the liquor traffic should not be the only basis.

armers at low rates of interest. Its tenets and aims are, ever, still too much in the stage of undefined aspiration windy demagogism to admit of being described with pre- on; nor would it be safe to predict a long life for it in its ent form, although it ran a candidate at the presidential tion of 1892 (carrying four States and obtaining one elec- l vote in each of two others), and although the economic social conditions of agricultural life in America are likely time to time to produce similar outbreaks of dissatisfac- , with impatient cries for unpractical remedies.

he advocates of Woman's Suffrage cannot be reckoned a y, because women have no vote in presidential elections e in Wyoming and Colorado), and because they do not run residential candidate. In 1884 a woman was nominated, did not go to the poll.[1]

he European reader may perhaps wish to hear something o the new group which goes by the name of Mugwumps.[2] he presidential election of 1884 a section of the Republi- party, more important by the intelligence and social posi- of the men who composed it than by its voting power, lted" (to use the technical term) from their party, and re- d to support Mr. Blaine. Some simply abstained, some, ing the impulse to vote which is strong in good citizens merica, voted for Mr. St. John, the Prohibitionist candi- , though well aware that this was practically the same g as abstention. The majority, however, voted against party for Mr. Cleveland, the Democratic candidate; and eems to have been the transference of their vote which ed the balance in New York State, and thereby deter- ed the issue of the whole election in Mr. Cleveland's ur. They were therefore not to be reckoned as a national y, according to the American use of the term, because they not run a ticket of their own, but supported a candidate ed by one of the regular parties. The only organization formed consisted of committees which held meetings and

ee further as to women's suffrage, Chapter XCVI.

he name is said to be formed from an Indian word denoting a chief or wise man, and was applied by the "straight-out" Republicans to their g brethren as a term of ridicule. It was then taken up by the latter as a of compliment; though the description they used formally in 1884 was f "Independent Republicans."

distributed literature during the election, but dissolved when it was over. They have maintained no permanent party machinery; and did not act as a distinct section, even for the purposes of agitation, at the presidential elections of 1888 and 1892.[1] So many of them have since been absorbed (especially in New England and New York) into the Democratic party that they cannot be now described as a section, but rather as a Tendency, or as persons in whom a strong and growing disposition to independence becomes from time to time embodied.

The Mugwumps bear no more resemblance to any British party than does any other of the parties of the United States, for the chief doctrine they advocate is one not in controversy in Britain, the necessity of reforming the civil service by making appointments without reference to party, and a general reform in the methods of politics by selecting men for Federal, State, and municipal offices, with reference rather to personal fitness than to political affiliations. They are most numerous in New England and in the cities of the Eastern States generally, but some few are scattered here and there all over the North and West as far as California. It is, however, only in New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut that they seem to have constituted an appreciably potent vote. In the South (save in such border cities as St. Louis and Louisville) there were none, because the Southern men who would, had they lived in the North, have taken to Mugwumpism, are in the South Democrats, and therefore voted for Mr. Cleveland anyhow in 1884, 1888, and 1892. Nor did there seem to be in the Democratic party, either in North or South, as much material for a secession similar to that of the "bolters" of 1884 as was then shown to exist among the Republicans. In 1893 however, an enormous "swing-over" in New York State of votes usually Democratic to the Republican side, provoked by the nomination of a man deemed tainted to an important judicial office, showed that the Mugwump element or tendency was to be reckoned with, at least in the North-eastern States, by both parties alike.

The reader must be reminded of one capital difference be

[1] In 1888 some voted for Mr. Harrison, some, and especially those inclined to free trade, for Mr. Cleveland. In 1892 even those who had not formally joined the Democrats seem to have voted on that side.

en the Republican and Democratic parties and the minor s which have just been mentioned. The two former are abso- ely co-extensive with the Union. They exist in every State, in every corner of every State. They exist even in the r Territories, though the inhabitants of Territories have vote in Federal elections. But the Labour party and the hibition party, although each maintains a more or less per- nent organization in many States, do not attempt to do so all States,[1] much less to fight all the elections in those tes. The "People's Party," while for the moment strong he West, has no importance in the Atlantic States, though "Farmers' Alliance" men developed strength in 1890 in te elections in parts of the South, especially in South Caro- . Where these minor parties are strong, or where some stion has arisen which keenly interests them, they will run r man for State governor or mayor, or will put out a ticket State senators or Assembly men: or they will take the n more profitable course of fusing for the nonce with one he regular parties, giving it their vote in return for having party nominations to one or more of the elective offices gned to their own nominee.[2] This helps to keep a minor y going, and gives to its vote a practical result otherwise ttainable.

s there not then, some European may ask, a Free Trade y? Not in the American sense of the word "party." Free e views are professed by most Democrats, especially in the th and West (though rather in the practical form of the ad- acy of a reduced tariff than in that of the general doctrine as as preached by Cobden) and by some few Republicans whose

n the election of 1880, votes were given for the Greenback candidate in e States but three (308,578 votes in all), and for the Prohibitionist in teen States out of the thirty-eight (10,305 votes in all). In 1884 votes given for the Greenback candidate in twenty-nine States, and for the Pro- onist in thirty-three States. In 1888 there was some scattering, and the ur party was divided. In 1892 the "People's Party" candidate received in every State, the Prohibitionist in forty-one, the "Socialist Labour" e States.

The Labour men have done this pretty frequently, the Prohibitionists ely ever. In 1892 the so-called "Populists" and the Democrats "fused" States, the latter voting for the Presidential candidate of the former, the result that the People's Party carried four of these States. In Louisi- somewhat similar arrangement was made between the "People's Party" he Republicans; but the Democrats carried the State notwithstanding.

importance is due not to their numbers, but to the influence they exert as writers or teachers. But Republican Free Traders, being largely Mugwumps, have now latterly tended to drift into the Democratic party. There is a society which seeks to educate opinion by publishing books and pamphlets on the subject; but it is no more a political force than the similar society in France or the Cobden Club in England. There is no political organization which agitates for free trade by the usual party methods, much less does any one think of starting candidates either for the Presidency or for Congress upon a pure anti-protectionist platform,[1] although the election of 1888, and still more that of 1892, largely turned upon this particular issue, which the so-called McKinley Tariff Act of 1890 had made prominent.

Why, considering the reluctant hesitancy of the old parties in dealing with new questions, and considering also that in the immense area of the United States, with its endless variety of economic interests and social conditions, we might expect local diversities of aim and view which would crystallize, and so give rise to many local parties — why are not the parties far more numerous? Why, too, are the parties so persistent? In this changeful country one would look for frequent changes in tenets and methods.

One reason is, that there is at present a strong feeling in America against any sentiment or organization which relies on or appeals to one particular region of the country. Such localism or sectionalism is hateful, because, recalling the disunionist spirit of the South which led to the war, it seems anti-national and unpatriotic. By the mere fact of its springing from a local root, and urging a local interest, a party would set all the rest of the country against it. As a separately organized faction seeking to capture the Federal government, it could not succeed against the national parties, because the Union as a whole is so vast that it would be outvoted by one or other of them. But if it is content to remain a mere opinion or demand, not attacking either national party, but willing to bestow the votes it can control on whichever will meet its wishes, it is powerful, because the two great parties

[1] It would be absurd to run candidates for State office or municipal office on such a platform, inasmuch as the tariff is a matter purely for the national legislature.

bid against one another for its support by flatteries and cessions. For instance, the question which interests the ses on the Pacific coast is that of excluding Chinese migrants, because they compete for work with the whites bring down wages. Now if the "anti-Mongolians" of fornia, Nevada, and Oregon were to create a national party, d on this particular issue, they would be insignificant, for would have little support over five-sixths of the Union. by showing that the attitude of the two great parties on issue will determine their own attitude towards these ies, they control both, for as each desires to secure the of California, Nevada, and Oregon, each vies with the r in promising and voting for anti-Chinese legislation. position of the Irish extremists has been similar, except of se that they are a racial and not a geographical "section." ir power, which Congress has sometimes recognized in a scarcely compatible with its dignity or with international tesy, lies in the fact that as the Republicans and Demos are nearly balanced, the congressional leaders of both re to "placate" this faction, for which neither has a ere affection. An Irish party, or a German party, or a an Catholic party, which should run its candidates on tional platform, would stand self-condemned in American as not being genuinely American. But so long as it is ent to seek control over parties and candidates, it exerts nfluence out of proportion to its numbers, and checked only he fear that if it demanded too much native Americans nt rebel, as they did in the famous Know-nothing or nerican" party of 1853–58. The same fate would befall a y based upon some trade interest, such as protection to rticular sort of manufactures, or the stimulation of cattle-ding, or on the defence of the claims of the New England rmen. Such a party might succeed for a time in a State, might dictate its terms to one or both of the national par-but when it attempted to be a national party it would me ridiculous and fall.

second cause of the phenomenon which I am endeavour-to explain may be found in the enormous trouble and nse required to found a new national party. To influence otes, even to reach the ears of a population of sixty-six

millions of people, is an undertaking to be entered on only when some really great cause fires the national imagination, disposes the people to listen, persuades the wealthy to spend freely of their substance. It took six years of intense work to build up the Republican party, which might not even then have triumphed in the election of 1860, but for the split in the ranks of its opponents. The attempt made in 1872 to form a new independent party out of the discontented Republicans and the Democrats failed lamentably. The Independent Republicans of 1884 did not venture to start a programme or candidate of their own, but were prudently satisfied with helping the Democratic candidate, whom they deemed more likely than the Republican nominee to give effect to the doctrine of civil service reform which they advocate.

The case of these Independents, or Mugwumps, is an illustrative one. For many years past there had been complaints that the two old parties were failing to deal with issues now of capital importance, such as the tariff, the currency, the improvement of methods of business in Congress, the purification of the civil service and extinction of the so-called Spoils system. These complaints, however, came not from the men prominent as practical statesmen or politicians in the parties, but from outsiders, and largely from the men of intellectual cultivation and comparatively high social standing. Very few of these men take an active part in "politics," however interested they may be in public affairs. They are amateurs as regards the practical work of "running" ward meetings and conventions, of framing "tickets," and bringing up voters to the poll, in fact of working as well as organizing that vast and complicated machinery which an American party needs. Besides, it is a costly machinery, and they might be unable to find the money. Hence they recoil from the effort, and aim at creating a sentiment which may take concrete form in a vote given for whichever of the parties seems at any particular time most likely to adopt, even if insincerely, the principles and give effect, even if reluctantly, to the measures which the Independents advocate.

Why, however, does it so seldom happen that the professional politicians, who "know the ropes," and know where to get the necessary funds, seek to wreck a party in order to found

w one more to their mind? Because they are pretty well sfied with the sphere which existing parties give them, comprehend from their practical experience how hazardous an experiment would be.

hese considerations may help to explain the remarkable sion of parties in America, and the strength of party lty, a phenomenon more natural in Europe, where momen- issues inflame men's passions, and where the bulk of the erents are ignorant men, caught by watchwords and readily acted to a leader, than in a republic where no party has benefit to promise to the people which it may not as well from the other, and where the native voter is a keen-witted , with little reverence for the authority of any individual. re is however another reason flowing from the character of American people. They are extremely fond of associating nselves, and prone to cling to any organization they have joined. They are sensitive to any charge of disloyalty. y are gregarious, each man more disposed to go with the itude and do as they do than to take a line of his own,[1] they enjoy "campaigning" for its own sake. These are acteristics which themselves require to be accounted for, the discussion of them belongs to later chapters. A pean is surprised to see prominent politicians supporting, etimes effusively, a candidate of their own party whom are known to dislike, merely because he is the party idate. There is a sort of military discipline about party which has its good as well as its bad side, for if it some- s checks the expression of honest disapproval, it also ains jealousy, abashes self-seeking, prevents recrimination. ch of the American parties is far less under the control of or two conspicuous leaders than are European parties. So s this is due to the absence of men whose power over the le rests on the possession of brilliant oratorical or adminis- ve gifts, it is a part of the question why there are not such men in American public life, why there are fewer ing figures than in the days of Jefferson and Hamilton, of ster and Calhoun. It is however also due to the pecul-

[1] That is to say, they respect the authority of the mass, to which they them- belong, though seldom that of individual leaders. See *post*, Chapter XV. — "The Fatalism of the Multitude."

3003

iarities of the Constitution. The want of concentration of power in the legal government is reflected in the structure of the party system. The separation of the legislative from the executive department lowers the importance of leadership in parties, as it weakens both these departments. The President, who is presumably among the leading men, cannot properly direct the policy of his party, still less speak for it in public, because he represents the whole nation. His ministers cannot speak to the people through Congress. In neither House of Congress is there necessarily any person recognized as the leader on either side. As neither House has the power over legislation and administration possessed by such an assembly as the French or Italian Chamber, or the English House of Commons, speeches delivered or strategy displayed in it do not tell upon the country with equal force and directness. There remains the stump, and it is more by the stump than in any other way that an American statesman speaks to the people. But what distances to be traversed, what fatigues to be encountered before he can be a living and attractive personality to the electing masses! An English statesman leaves London at two o'clock, and speaks in Birmingham, or Leeds, or Manchester the same evening. In a few years, every great town knows him like its own mayor, while the active local politicians who frequently run up from their homes to London hear him from the galleries of the House of Commons, wait on him in deputations, are invited to the receptions which his wife gives during the season. Even railways and telegraphs cannot make America a compact country in the same sense that Britain is.

Since the Civil War ended, neither Republicans nor Democrats have leaned on and followed any one man as Mr. Gladstone and Lord Beaconsfield, as before them Lords Derby, John Russell, and Palmerston, as still earlier Sir Robert Peel and Lord Melbourne, were followed in England. No one since Mr. Seward has exercised even so much authority as Mr. Bright did when out of office, or as Gambetta did in France, or Mr. Parnell in Ireland, over the sections of opinion which each of these eminent men represented.

How then are the parties led in Congress and the country? Who directs their policy? Who selects their candidates for the most important posts? These are questions which cannot

dequately answered till the nature of the party machinery been described. For the moment I must be content to sug- the following as provisional answers:—

he chief thing is the selection of candidates. This is done arty meetings called conventions. When a party has a cy, it is settled in a convention and declared in a docu- t called a platform. When it has none, the platform is ed none the less. Party tactics in Congress are decided y meetings of the party in each House of Congress called uses. Leaders have of course much to do with all three esses. But they often efface themselves out of respect to sentiment of equality, and because power concealed excites envy.

ow do the parties affect social life? At present not very h, at least in the northern and middle States, because it is a paratively slack time in politics. Your dining acquain- es, even your intimate friends, are not necessarily of the e way of voting as yourself, and though of course political s tend to become hereditary, there is nothing to surprise one in finding sons belonging to different parties from their ers. Social boycotting on political grounds, such as largely ails in rural England, is unknown. In the South, where recollections of the great struggle are kept alive by the ence of a negro voting power which has to be controlled, gs are different: and they were different in the North till passions of civil strife had abated.

far, I have spoken of the parties only as national organiza- , struggling for and acting on or through the Federal rnment. But it has already been observed (CHAPTER I.) that they exist also as State and city organizations, ending for the places which States and cities have to give, ng to control State legislatures and municipal councils. y circumscription of State and local government, from the e of New York with its six millions of inhabitants down to city" that has just sprung up round a railway junction in West, has a regular Republican party organization, con- ed by a similar Democratic organization, each running its ticket (*i.e.* list of candidates) at every election, for any pertaining to its own circumscription, and each federated, speak, to the larger organizations above it, represented in

them and working for them in drilling and "energizing" the party within the area which is the sphere of its action.

What have the tenets of such national parties as the Republicans and Democrats to do with the politics of States and cities? Very little with those of States, because a matter for Federal legislation is seldom also a matter for State legislation. Still less with those of cities or counties. Cities and counties have not strictly speaking any political questions to deal with; their business is to pave and light, to keep the streets clean, maintain an efficient police and well-barred prisons, administer the poor law and charitable institutions with integrity, judgment, and economy. The laws regulating these matters have been already made by the State, and the city or county authority has nothing to do but administer them. Hence at city and county elections the main objects ought to be to choose honest and careful men of business. It need make no difference to the action of a mayor or school trustee in any concrete question whether he holds Democratic or Republican views.

However, the habit of party warfare has been so strong as to draw all elections into its vortex; nor would either party feel safe if it neglected the means of rallying and drilling its supporters, which State and local contests supply. There is this advantage in the system, that it stimulates the political interest of the people, which is kept alive by this perpetual agitation. But the multiplicity of contests has the effect of making politics too absorbing an occupation for the ordinary citizen who has his profession or business to attend to; while the result claimed by those who in England defend the practice of fighting municipal elections on party lines, viz. that good men are induced to stand for local office for the sake of their party, is the last result desired by the politicians, or expected by any one. It is this constant labour which the business of politics involves, this ramification of party into all the nooks and corners of local government, that has produced the class of professional politicians, of whom it is now time to speak.

CHAPTER LVII

THE POLITICIANS

INSTITUTIONS are said to form men, but it is no less true that n give to institutions their colour and tendency. It profits le to know the legal rules and methods and observances of ernment, unless one also knows something of the human ngs who tend and direct this machinery, and who, by the rit in which they work it, may render it the potent instrument good or evil to the people. These men are the politicians. What is one to include under this term? In England it ally denotes those who are actively occupied in adminis- ng or legislating, or discussing administration and leg- tion. That is to say, it includes ministers of the Crown, mbers of Parliament (though some in the House of Com- ns and the majority in the House of Lords care little ut politics), a few leading journalists, and a small number miscellaneous persons, writers, lecturers, organizers, agita- s, who occupy themselves with trying to influence the public. metimes the term is given a wider sweep, being taken to lude all who labour for their political party in the constitu- ies, as *e.g.* the chairmen and secretaries of local party ociations, and the more active committee men of the same ies.[1] The former, whom we may call the Inner Circle n, are professional politicians in this sense, and in this sense y, that politics is the main though seldom the sole business heir lives. But at present extremely few of them make any- ng by it in the way of money. A handful hope to get some t; a somewhat larger number conceive that a seat in Parlia- nt may enable them to push their financial undertakings or

[1] In America (Canada as well as the United States) people do not say liticians," but "the politicians," because the word indicates a class with ain defined characteristics.

make them at least more conspicuous in the commercial world. But the gaining of a livelihood does not come into the view of the great majority at all. The other class, who may be called the Outer Circle, are not professionals in any sense, being primarily occupied with their own avocations; and none of them, except here and there an organizing secretary, paid lecturer, or registration agent, makes any profit out of the work.[1] The phenomena of France and Italy and Germany are generally similar, that is to say, those who devote their whole time to politics are a very small class, those who make a living by it an even smaller one.[2] Of all the countries of Europe, Greece is that in which persons who spend their life in politics seem to bear the largest proportion to the whole population; and in Greece the pursuit of politics is usually the pursuit of place.

To see why things are different in the United States, why the Inner Circle is much larger both absolutely and relatively to the Outer Circle than in Europe, let us go back a little and ask what are the conditions which develop a political class. The point has so important a bearing on the characteristics of American politicians that I do not fear to dwell somewhat fully upon it.

In self-governing communities of the simpler kind — for one may leave absolute monarchies and feudal monarchies on one side — the common affairs are everybody's business and nobody's special business. Some few men by their personal qualities get a larger share of authority, and are repeatedly chosen to be archons, or generals, or consuls, or burgomasters, or landammans, but even these rarely give their whole time to the State, and make little or nothing in money out of it. This was the condition of the Greek republics, of early Rome,[3] of

[1] Of course now and then a man who has worked hard for his party is rewarded by a place. Barristers who have spent their substance in contesting seats have a better chance of judgeships, and there are usually five or six practising counsel in the House of Commons who are supposed to contemplate the possibility of obtaining legal office. But these cases are so few as to make no practical difference.

[2] The number of persons who live off politics by getting places or by manipulating finance is said to have increased in France of late years. But it cannot be very large even now.

[3] The principal business in life of Cincinnatus was to till his fields, and a dictatorship a mere interlude. When I waited on the president of the Republic of Andorra, one of the oldest states in Europe, twenty years ago, I found him with his coat off wielding a flail at the door of his barn.

cities of mediæval Germany and Italy, of the cantons of itzerland till very recent times.

When in a large country public affairs become more engrossing those who are occupied in them, when the sphere of governnt widens, when administration is more complex and more sely interlaced with the industrial interests of the community l of the world at large, so that there is more to be known and be considered, the business of a nation falls into the hands of men eminent by rank, wealth, and ability, who form a sort governing class, largely hereditary. The higher civil adminration of the state is in their hands; they fill the chief council egislative chamber and conduct its debates. They have resices in the capital, and though they receive salaries when ually filling an office, and have opportunities for enriching mselves, the majority possess independent means, and pur- politics for the sake of fame, power, or excitement. Those who have not independent means can follow their business profession in the capital, or can frequently visit the place ere their business is carried on. This was the condition of ne under the later republic,[1] and of England and France till te lately — indeed it is largely the case in England still — well as of Prussia and Sweden.[2]

Let us see what are the conditions of the United States.

There is a relatively small leisured class of persons engaged no occupation and of wealth sufficient to leave them free for lic affairs. So far as such persons are to be found in the ntry, for some are to be sought abroad, they are to be found few great cities.

There is no class with a hereditary prescription to public e, no great families whose names are known to the people, who, bound together by class sympathy and ties of relation-, help one another by keeping offices in the hands of their members.

[1] Rome in the later days of the republic had practically become a country, is to say, the range of her authority and the mass of her public business much greater than in any of the Greek cities, even in Athens in the days ericles. The chances of making illicit gains were great, but confined to all number of persons.

[2] Norway, the most democratic of the monarchical countries of Europe, is ne which has probably the smallest class of persons continuously occupied politics.

The country is a very large one, and has its political capital in a city without trade, without manufactures, without professional careers. Even the seats of State governments are often placed in comparatively small towns.[1] Hence a man cannot carry on his gainful occupation at the same time that he attends to "Inner Circle" politics.

Members of Congress and of State legislatures are invariably chosen from the places where they reside. Hence a person belonging to the leisured class of a great city cannot get into the House of Representatives or the legislature of his State except as member for a district of his own city.

The shortness of terms of office, and the large number of offices filled by election, make elections very frequent. All these elections, with trifling exceptions, are fought on party lines, and the result of a minor one for some petty local office, such as county treasurer, affects one for a more important post, *e.g.* that of member of Congress. Hence constant vigilance, constant exertions on the spot, are needed. The list of voters must be incessantly looked after, newly-admitted or newly-settled citizens enrolled, the active local men frequently consulted and kept in good humour, meetings arranged for, tickets (*i.e.* lists of candidates) for all vacant offices agreed upon. One election is no sooner over than another approaches and has to be provided for, as the English sporting man reckons his year by "events," and thinks of Newmarket after Ascot, and of Goodwood after Newmarket.

Now what do these conditions amount to? To this — A great deal of hard and dull election and other local political work to be done. Few men of leisure to do it, and still fewer men of leisure likely to care for it. Nobody able to do it in addition to his regular business or profession. Little motive for anybody, whether leisured or not, to do the humbler and local parts of it (*i.e.* so much as concerns the minor elections), the parts which bring neither fame nor power.

If the work is to be done at all, some inducement, other than fame or power, must clearly be found. Why not, some one will

[1] *E.g.* The seat of government for Maryland is Annapolis, not Baltimore; for Ohio, Columbus, not Cincinnati; for Illinois, Springfield, not Chicago; for California, Sacramento, not San Francisco; for Washington, Olympia, not Seattle or Tacoma; for Louisiana, Baton Rouge, not New Orleans.

, the sense of public duty? I will speak of public duty esently: meantime let it suffice to remark that to rely on blic duty as the main motive power in politics is to assume ommonwealth of angels. Men such as we know them must ve some other inducement. Even in the Christian Church ere are other than spiritual motives to lead its pastors to ritual work; nor do all poets write because they seek to press the passion of their souls. In America we discover alpable inducement to undertake the dull and toilsome work election politics. It is the inducement of places in the public vice. To make them attractive they must be paid. They paid, nearly all of them, memberships of Congress[1] and ier Federal places, State places (including memberships of ate legislatures), city and county places. Here then is the lucement, the remuneration for political work performed in way of organizing and electioneering. Now add that besides paid administrative and legislative places which a democ- y bestows by election, judicial places are also in most of the ates elective, and held for terms of years only; and add ther, that the holders of nearly all those administrative ces, Federal, State, and municipal, which are not held for a ed term, are liable to be dismissed, and have been hitherto in ctice dismissed, whenever power changes from one party to ther,[2] so that those who belong to the party out of office have direct chance of office when their party comes in. The ucement to undertake political work we have been searching is at once seen to be adequate, and only too adequate. The n for the work are certain to appear because remuneration is vided. Politics has now become a gainful profession, like ocacy, stockbroking, the dry goods trade, or the getting up companies. People go into it to live by it, primarily for the e of the salaries attached to the places they count on getting, ondarily in view of the opportunities it affords of making idental and sometimes illegitimate gains. Every person in a

[1] Though, as observed in a previous chapter, the payment of members of gress does not seem to have any marked effect in lowering the type of abers. It is the offices rather than legislative posts that sustain the pro- onal class.

[2] This was the practice up to within the last few years. It has been modi- lately in consequence of the progress of the civil service reform movement. re are now 27,000 postmasters within the civil service rules.

high administrative post, whether Federal, State, or municipal, and, above all, every member of Congress, has opportunities of rendering services to wealthy individuals and companies for which they are willing to pay secretly in money or in money's worth. The better officials and legislators — they are the great majority, except in large cities — resist the temptation. The worst succumb to it; and the prospect of these illicit profits renders a political career distinctly more attractive to an unscrupulous man.

We find therefore that in America all the conditions exist for producing a class of men specially devoted to political work and making a livelihood by it. It is work much of which cannot be done in combination with any other kind of regular work, whether professional or commercial. Even if the man who unites wealth and leisure to high intellectual attainments were a frequent figure in America, he would not take to this work; he would rather be a philanthropist or cultivate arts and letters. It is work which, steadily pursued by an active man, offers an income. Hence a large number of persons are drawn into it, and make it the business of their life; and the fact that they are there as professionals has tended to keep amateurs out of it.

There are, however, two qualifications which must be added to this statement of the facts, and which it is best to add at once. One is that the mere pleasure of politics counts for something. Many people in America as well as in England undertake even the commonplace work of local canvassing and organizing for the sake of a little excitement, a little of the agreeable sense of self-importance, or from that fondness for doing something in association with others which makes a man become secretary to a cricket club or treasurer of a fund raised by subscription for some purpose he may not really care for. And the second qualification is that pecuniary motives operate with less force in rural districts than in cities, because in the former the income obtainable by public office is too small to induce men to work long in the hope of getting it. Let it therefore be understood that what is said in this chapter refers primarily to cities, and of course also to persons aiming at the higher Federal and State offices; and that I do not mean to deny that there is plenty of work done by amateurs as well as by professionals.

Having thus seen what are the causes which produce profes-nal politicians, we may return to inquire how large this class compared with the corresponding class in the free countries Europe, whom we have called the Inner Circle.

In America the Inner Circle, that is to say, the persons who ke political work the chief business of life, for the time ng, includes: —

First. All members of both Houses of Congress.

Secondly. All Federal office-holders except the judges, who irremovable, and the "classified civil service."

Thirdly. A large part of the members of State legislatures. w large a part, it is impossible to determine, for it varies atly from State to State. I should guess that in New York, nnsylvania, New Jersey, California, Maryland, and Louisi-a, half the members were professional politicians; in Ohio, ginia, Illinois, Texas, less than half; in Connecticut, Geor-, Kentucky, Iowa, Oregon, not more than one-fourth; in Mas-husetts, Vermont, and some other States, perhaps even less. t the line between a professional and non-professional politi-n is too indefinite to make any satisfactory estimate possible.

Fourthly. Nearly all State office-holders, excluding all judges a very few States, and many of the judges in the rest.

Fifthly. Nearly all holders of paid offices in the greater and many of the smaller cities, and many holders of paid offices the counties. There are, however, great differences in this pect between different States, the New England States and newer States of the North-west, as well as some Southern tes, choosing many of their county officials from men who not regularly employed on politics, although members of dominant party.

Sixthly. A large number of people who hold no office but nt to get one. This category includes, of course, many of "workers" of the party which does not command the jority for the time being, in State and municipal affairs, and ich has not, through the President, the patronage of Federal ts. It also includes many expectants belonging to the party the time being dominant, who are earning their future places serving the party in the meantime.[1]

[1] But, as already observed, there are also in the rural districts and smaller ns many workers and expectants who do not look for places.

All the above may fairly be called professional or Inner Circle politicians, but of their number I can form no estimate, save that it must be counted by hundreds of thousands, inasmuch as it practically includes nearly all State and local and most Federal office-holders as well as most expectants of public office.[1]

It must be remembered that the "work" of politics means in America the business of winning nominations (of which more anon) and elections, and that this work is incomparably heavier and more complex than in England, because: —

(1) The voters are a larger proportion of the population; (2) The government is more complex (Federal, State, and local) and the places filled by election are therefore far more numerous; (3) Elections come at shorter intervals; (4) The machinery of nominating candidates is far more complete and intricate; (5) The methods of fighting elections require more technical knowledge and skill; (6) Ordinary private citizens do less election work, seeing that they are busier than in England, and the professionals exist to do it for them.

I have observed that there are also plenty of men engaged in some trade or profession who interest themselves in politics and

[1] The Inner Circle may in England be roughly taken to include: —

Members of the House of Lords, say	80
Members of the House of Commons	670
Editors, and chief writers on leading newspapers, say	300
Expectant candidates for House of Commons, say . .	450
Persons who in each constituency devote most of their time to politics, *e.g.* secretaries of political associations, registration agents, etc., say	2000
	3500

Comparatively few newspapers are primarily political, and in many constituencies (*e.g.* Irish and Highland counties) there are very few persons occupied in political work. I do not, therefore, think this estimate too low.

In the United States there are now about 130,000 Federal offices. Allowing one expectant for each office (a small allowance), and assuming the State and local offices bestowed as the reward for political services to be equal in number to Federal offices (they are, of course, far more numerous), and allowing one expectant to each such office, we should have a total of over $120{,}000 \times 4 = 480{,}000$. Deducting from this total those who hold or aspire to Federal offices which have been "taken out of politics," those who, though they work for office, do not make such work their main business, and those who work with no special eye to office, we should still have a very large total, doubtless over 200,000, of persons whose chief occupation and livelihood lies in politics.

ork for their party without any definite hope of office or other ecuniary aim. They correspond to what we have called the uter Circle politicians of Europe. It is hard to draw a line tween the two classes, because they shade off into one nother, there being many farmers or lawyers or saloon-eepers, for instance, who, while pursuing their regular call-g, bear a hand in politics, and look to be some time or her rewarded for doing so. When this expectation becomes considerable part of the motive for exertion, such an one ay fairly be called a professional, at least for the time being, r although he has other means of livelihood, he is apt to be npregnated with the habits and sentiments of the professional ass.

The proportion between Outer Circle and Inner Circle men in the United States a sort of ozonometer by which the purity d healthiness of the political atmosphere may be tested. ooking at the North only, for it is hard to obtain trustworthy ta as to the South, and excluding congressmen, the proportion men who exert themselves in politics without pecuniary otive is largest in New England, in the country parts of New ork, in Northern Ohio, and the North-western States, while e professional politicians most abound in the great cities — ew York, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, Boston, Baltimore, Buf-o, Cincinnati, Louisville, Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, n Francisco. This is because these cities have the largest asses of ignorant voters, and also because their municipal vernments, handling vast revenues, offer the largest facili-s for illicit gains.

I shall presently return to the Outer Circle men. Meantime us examine the professionals somewhat more closely; and gin with those of the humbler type, whose eye is fixed on unicipal or other local office, and seldom ranges so high as eat in Congress.

As there are weeds that follow human dwellings, so this ecies thrives best in cities, and even in the most crowded cts of cities. It is known to the Americans as the "ward itician," because the city ward is the chief sphere of its ivity, and the ward meeting the first scene of its exploits. statesman of this type usually begins as a saloon or bar-eper, an occupation which enables him to form a large circle

of acquaintances, especially among the "loafer" class who have votes but no reason for using them one way more than another, and whose interest in political issues is therefore as limited as their stock of political knowledge. But he may have started as a lawyer of the lowest kind, or lodging-house keeper, or have taken to politics after failure in store-keeping. The education of this class is only that of the elementary schools: if they have come after boyhood from Europe, it is not even that. They have of course no comprehension of political questions or zeal for political principles; politics mean to them merely a scramble for places or jobs. They are usually vulgar, sometimes brutal, not so often criminal, or at least the associates of criminals. They it is who move about the populous quarters of the great cities, form groups through whom they can reach and control the ignorant voter, pack meetings with their creatures.

Their methods and their triumphs must be reserved for a later chapter. Those of them who are Irish, an appreciable proportion in great cities, have seldom Irish patriotism to redeem the mercenary quality of their politics. They are too strictly practical for that, being regardful of the wrongs of Ireland only so far as these furnish capital to be used with Irish voters. Their most conspicuous virtues are shrewdness, a sort of rough good-fellowship with one another, and loyalty to their chiefs, from whom they expect promotion in the ranks of the service. The plant thrives in the soil of any party, but its growth is more vigorous in whichever party is for the time dominant in a given city.

English critics, taking their cue from American pessimists, have often described these men as specimens of the whole class of politicians. This is misleading. The men are bad enough both as an actual force and as a symptom. But they are confined to a few great cities, those eleven or twelve I have already mentioned; it is their achievements there, and particularly in New York, where the mass of ignorant immigrants is largest, that have made them famous.

In the smaller cities, and in the country generally, the minor politicians are mostly native Americans, less ignorant and more respectable than these last-mentioned street vultures. The bar-keeping element is represented among them, but the bulk

petty lawyers, officials, Federal as well as State and county, l people who for want of a better occupation have turned ce-seekers, with a fair sprinkling of store-keepers, farmers, l newspaper men. The great majority have some regular ocation, so that they are by no means wholly professionals. w is of course the business which best fits in with politics. ey are only a little below the level of the class to which they ong, which is what would be called in England the lower ddle, or in France the *petite bourgeoisie*, and they often sup- se themselves to be fighting for Republican or Democratic nciples, even though in fact concerned chiefly with place nting. It is not so much positive moral defects that are to charged on them as a sordid and selfish view of politics and axity, sometimes amounting to fraud, in the use of election- ing methods.

These two classes do the local work and dirty work of politics. ey are the rank and file. Above them stand the officers in political army, the party managers, including the members Congress and chief men in the State legislatures, and the tors of influential newspapers. Some of these have pushed ir way up from the humbler ranks. Others are men of perior ability and education, often college graduates, lawyers o have had practice, less frequently merchants or manufact- rs who have slipped into politics from business. There are sorts among them, creatures clean and unclean, as in the et of St. Peter's vision, but that one may say of politicians ll countries. What characterizes them as compared with corresponding class in Europe is that their whole time is re frequently given to political work, that most of them draw income from politics and the rest hope to do so, that they ne more largely from the poorer and less cultivated than n the higher ranks of society, and that they include but few n who have pursued any of those economical, social, or con- utional studies which form the basis of politics and legisla- , although many are proficients in the arts of popular tory, of electioneering, and of party management.

They show a high average level of practical cleverness and satility, and a good deal of legal knowledge. They are ally correct in life, for intoxication as well as sexual norality is condemned by American more severely than by

European opinion, but are often charged with a low tone, with laxity in pecuniary matters, with a propensity to commit or to excuse jobs, with a deficient sense of the dignity which public office confers and the responsibility it implies. I shall elsewhere discuss the validity of these charges, and need only observe here that even if the last thirty years have furnished some grounds for accusing the class as a whole, there are many brilliant exceptions, many leading politicians whose honour is as stainless and patriotism as pure as that of the best European statesmen. In this general description I am simply repeating what non-political Americans themselves say. It is possible that with their half-humorous tendency to exaggerate they dwell too much on the darker side of their public life. My own belief is that things are healthier than the newspapers and common talk lead a traveller to believe, and that the blackness of the worst men in the large cities has been allowed to darken the whole class of politicians as the smoke from a few factories will darken the sky over a whole town. However, the sentiment I have described is no doubt the general sentiment. "Politician" is a term of reproach, not merely among the "superfine philosophers" of New England colleges, but among the better sort of citizens over the whole Union. "How did such a job come to be perpetrated?" I remember once asking a casual acquaintance who had been pointing out some scandalous waste of public money. "Why, what can you expect from the politicians?" was the surprised answer.

Assuming these faults to exist, to what causes are they to be ascribed? Granted that politics has to become a gainful profession, may it not still be practised with as much integrity as other professions? Do not the higher qualities of intellect, the ripe fruits of experience and study, win for a man ascendancy here as in Europe? Does not the suspicion of dishonour blight his influence with a public which is itself at least as morally exacting as that of any European country? These are questions which can be better answered when the methods of party management have been described, the qualities they evoke appreciated, their reaction on men's character understood.

It remains to speak of the non-professional or Outer Circle politicians, those who work for their party without desiring

ffice. These men were numerous and zealous shortly before nd during the Civil War, when the great questions of the xclusion of slavery from the Territories and the preservation f the Union kindled the enthusiasm of the noblest spirits of ie North, women as well as men. No country ever produced ftier types of dauntless courage and uncompromising devotion principle than William Lloyd Garrison and his fellow-orkers in the Abolitionist cause. Office came to Abraham incoln, but he would have served his party just as earnestly there had been no office to reward him.[1] Nor was there any ant of high-souled patriotism in the South. The people gave eir blood freely, and among the leaders there were many who ffered up fine characters as well as brilliant talents on an altar hich all but themselves deemed unhallowed. When these reat issues were finally settled, and the generation whose man-ood they filled began to pass away, there was less motive for rdinary citizens to trouble themselves about public affairs. ence the professional politicians had the field left free; and they were ready to take the troublesome work of organizing, ie ordinary citizen was contented to be superseded, and thought e did enough when he went to the poll for his party. Still ere are districts where a good deal of unpaid and disinterested olitical work is done. In some parts of New England, New ork, and Ohio, for instance, citizens of position bestir them-lves to rescue the control of local elections from the ward oliticians. In the main, however, the action of the Outer ircle consists in voting, and this the ordinary native citizen oes more steadily and intelligently than anywhere in Europe, nless perhaps in Switzerland. Doubtless much of the work hich Outer Circle politicians do in Europe is in America one by professionals. But that lively interest in politics nich the English Outer Circle feels, and which is not felt, ve at exceptional moments, by the English public generally, in America felt by the bulk of the nation, that is to say, by e large majority of native white Americans, and even by the tter sort of immigrants, or, in other words, the American

[1] Lincoln was never a professional politician, for he continued to practise a lawyer till he became President: but he was so useful to his party that some years before 1860 he had been obliged to spend great part of his ne in political work, and probably some would have called him a profes-nal.

Outer Circle comes nearer to including the whole nation than does the Outer Circle of England. Thus the influence which counterworks that of professionals is the influence of public opinion expressing itself constantly through its countless voices in the press, and more distinctly at frequent intervals by the ballot-box. I say "counterworks," because, while in Europe the leaders and still more the average legislators share and help to make public opinion, in the United States the politician stands rather outside, and regards public opinion as a factor to be reckoned with, much as the sailor regards the winds and currents that affect his course. His primary aim, unless he be exceptionally disinterested, is place and income: and it is in this sense that he may be described as a member of a definite profession.

CHAPTER LVIII

WHY THE BEST MEN DO NOT GO INTO POLITICS

"But," some one will say, who has read the reasons just ssigned for the development of a class of professional politi- ans, "you allow nothing for public spirit. It is easy to show hy the prize of numerous places should breed a swarm of office- eekers, not so easy to understand why the office-seekers should e allowed to have this arena of public life in a vast country, free country, an intelligent country, all to themselves. here ought to be patriotic citizens ready to plunge into the ream and save the boat from drifting towards the rapids. hey would surely have the support of the mass of the people ho must desire honest and economical administration. If ich citizens stand aloof, there are but two explanations pos- ble. Either public life must be so foul that good men cannot ter it, or good men must be sadly wanting in patriotism."

This kind of observation is so common in European mouths to need an explicit answer. The answer is two-fold.

In the first place, the arena is not wholly left to the profes- onals. Both the Federal and the State legislatures contain fair proportion of upright and disinterested men, who enter iefly, or largely, from a sense of public duty, and whose esence keeps the mere professionals in order. So does pub- opinion, deterring even the bad men from the tricks to nich they are prone, and often driving them, when detected a serious offence, from place and power.

However, this first answer is not a complete answer, for it ust be admitted that the proportion of men of intellectual d social eminence who enter public life is smaller in America an it has been during the present century in each of the free untries of Europe. Does this fact indicate a want of public irit?

It is much to be wished that in every country public spirit were the chief motive propelling men into public life. But is it so anywhere now? Has it been so at any time in a nation's history? Let any one in England, dropping for the moment that self-righteous attitude of which Englishmen are commonly accused by foreigners, ask himself how many of those whom he knows as mixing in the public life of his own country have entered it from motives primarily patriotic, how many have been actuated by the love of fame or power, the hope of advancing their social pretensions or their business relations. There is nothing necessarily wrong in such forms of ambition; but if we find that they count for much in the public life of one country, and for comparatively little in the public life of another, we must expect to find the latter able to reckon among its statesmen fewer persons of eminent intelligence and energy.

Now there are several conditions present in the United States, conditions both constitutional and social, conditions independent either of political morality or of patriotism, which make the ablest citizens less disposed to enter political life than they would otherwise be, or than persons of the same class are in Europe. I have already referred to some of these but recapitulate them shortly here because they are specially important in this connection.

The want of a social and commercial capital is such a cause. To be a Federal politician you must live in Washington, that is, abandon your circle of home friends, your profession or business, your local public duties. But to live in Paris or London is of itself an attraction to many Englishmen and Frenchmen.

There is no class in America to which public political life comes naturally, scarcely any families with a sort of hereditary right to serve the State. Nobody can get an early and easy start on the strength of his name and connections, as still happens in several European countries.

In Britain or France a man seeking to enter the higher walks of public life has more than five hundred seats for which he may stand. If his own town or county is impossible he goes elsewhere. In the United States he cannot. If his own district is already filled by a member of his own party, then

nothing to be done, unless he will condescend to undermine and supplant at the next nominating convention the sitng member. If he has been elected and happens to lose his vn re-nomination or re-election, he cannot re-enter Congress any other door. The fact that a man has served gives m no claim to be allowed to go on serving. In the West, tation is the rule. No wonder that, when a political career so precarious, men of worth and capacity hesitate to emace it. They cannot afford to be thrown out of their life's urse by a mere accident.[1]

Politics are less interesting than in Europe. The two kinds questions which most attract eager or ambitious minds, estions of foreign policy and of domestic constitutional ange, are generally absent, happily absent. Currency and riff questions and financial affairs generally, internal imovements, the regulation of railways and so forth, are portant, no doubt, but to some minds not fascinating. How w people in the English or French legislatures have mastered em, or would relish political life if it dealt with little else! here are no class privileges or religious inequalities to be olished. Religion, so powerful a political force in Europe, outside politics altogether.

In most European countries there has been for many years st an upward pressure of the poorer or the unprivileged sses, a pressure which has seemed to threaten the wealthier d more particularly the landowning class. Hence members the latter class have had a strong motive for keeping tight ld of the helm of state. They have felt a direct personal erest in sitting in the legislature and controlling the adnistration of their country. This has not been so in America. great political issues have not hitherto been class issues. On contrary there has been, till within the last few years, so at and general a sense of economic security, whether well or founded I do not now inquire, that the wealthy and educated ve been content to leave the active work of politics alone.

[1] The tendency in Switzerland to re-elect the same men to the legislature to public office has doubtless worked as much for good in politics there as opposite tendency works for evil in the United States. Men who have ported measures which their constituency disapproves are often re-elected ause they are thought honest and capable. The existence of the *referendum* facilitates this.

The division of legislative authority between the Federa Congress and the legislatures of the States further lessens th interest and narrows the opportunities of a political caree Some of the most useful members of the English Parliamen have been led to enter it by their zeal for philanthropic scheme and social reforms. Others enter because they are intereste in foreign politics or in commercial questions. In the Unite States foreign politics and commercial questions belong t Congress, so no one will be led by them to enter the legisla ture of his State. Social reforms and philanthropic enter prises belong to the State legislatures, so no one will be le by them to enter Congress. The limited sphere of each bod deprives it of the services of many active spirits who woul have been attracted by it had it dealt with both these sets o matters, or with the particular set of matters in which thei own particular interest happens to lie.

In America there are more easy and attractive openings int other careers than in most European countries. The settlemer of the great West, the making and financing of railways, th starting of industrial or commercial enterprises in the newe States, all offer a tempting field to ambition, ingenuity, an self-confidence. A man without capital or friends has a bette chance than in Europe, and as the scale of undertakings i vaster, the prizes are more seductive. Hence much of th practical ability which in the Old World goes to Parliamentar politics or to the civil administration of the state, goes i America into business, especially into railways and financ No class strikes one more by its splendid practical capacit than the class of railroad men. It includes administrativ rulers, generals, diplomatists, financiers, of the finest gift And in point of fact (as will be more fully shown later) th railroad kings have of late years swayed the fortunes o American citizens more than the politicians.

The fascination which politics have for many people i England is largely a social fascination. Those who belon by birth to the upper classes like to support their position i county society by belonging to the House of Commons, o by procuring either a seat in the House of Lords, or the lor lieutenancy of their county, or perhaps a post in the roy household. The easiest path to these latter dignities li

ough the Commons. Those who spring from the middle ss expect to find by means of politics an entrance into a re fashionable society than they have hitherto frequented. eir wives will at least be invited to the party receptions, they may entertain a party chieftain when he comes to dress a meeting in their town. Such inducements scarcely st in America. A congressman, a city mayor, even a State ernor, gains nothing socially by his position. There is in- d, except in a few Eastern cities with exclusive sets, really hing in the nature of a social prize set before social ambi- n, while the career of political ambition is even in those es wholly disjoined from social success. The only excep- n to this rule occurs in Washington, where a senator or inet minister enjoys *ex officio* a certain social rank.[1]

None of these causes is discreditable to America, yet, taken ether, they go far to account for the large development of professional element among politicians. Putting the ng broadly, one may say that in America, while politics relatively less interesting than in Europe and lead to less, er careers are relatively more interesting and lead to more.[2] t may however be alleged that I have omitted one signifi- t ground for the distaste of "the best people" for public , viz. the bad company they would have to keep, the general garity of tone in politics, the exposure to invective or rib- y by hostile speakers and a reckless press.

omit this ground because it seems insignificant. In every ntry a politician has to associate with men whom he despises distrusts, and those whom he most despises and distrusts sometimes those whose so-called social rank is highest —

[1] It is the same in some, though by no means in all, of the cantons of zerland. Office carries little or no social consideration with it. In some ons the old families have so completely withdrawn or become so com- ly shut out from public office, federal or cantonal, that it would be ned that a politician was necessarily a plebeian. I remember to have told in Bern of a foreign diplomatist who, strolling with one of the old cians of the city, stopped at the door of the Government offices. "Where you going?" asked the patrician. "To see one of your ministers on ness." "You don't mean that you are going to speak to one of that *ille!*" was the reply. The minister was, as Swiss statesmen generally a perfectly respectable man; but to a Bernese Junker his being a minister enough to condemn him.

[2] This is true even of eminence in letters or art. A great writer or eloquent cher is more honoured and valued in America than in England.

the sons or brothers of great nobles. In every country he i exposed to misrepresentation and abuse, and the most gallin misrepresentations are not the coarse and incredible ones, bu those which have a semblance of probability, which delicatel discolour his motives and ingeniously pervert his words. statesman must soon learn, even in decorous England or pun tilious France or polished Italy, to disregard all this, and rel upon his conscience for his peace of mind, and upon his co duct for the respect of his countrymen. If he can do so i England or France or Italy, he may do so in America als No more there than in Europe has any upright man bee written down, for though the American press is unsparin the American people are shrewd, and sometimes believe t little rather than too much evil of a man whom the pre assails. Although therefore one hears the pseudo-Europea American complain of newspaper violence, and allege that keeps him and his friends from doing their duty by the country, and although it sometimes happens that the fear newspaper attacks deters a good citizen from exposing son job or jobber, still I could not learn the name of any able a high-minded man of whom it could be truly said that throug this cause his gifts and virtues had been reserved for priva life. The roughness of politics has, no doubt, some influen on the view which wealthy Americans take of a public caree but these are just the Americans who think that Europea politics are worked, to use the common phrase, "with k gloves," and they are not the class most inclined anyhow come to the front for the service of the nation. Without den ing that there is recklessness in the American press, and notable want of refinement in politics generally, I dou whether these phenomena have anything like the importan which European visitors are taught, and willingly learn, attribute to them. Far more weight is to be laid upon t difficulties which the organization of the party system, to described in the following chapters, throws in the way of m who seek to enter public life. There is, as we shall see, mu that is disagreeable, much that is even humiliating, in t initial stages of a political career, and doubtless many a p grim turns back after a short experience of this Slough Despond.

o explain the causes which keep so much of the finest intel-
of the country away from national business is one thing,
eny the unfortunate results would be quite another. Un-
unate they certainly are. But the downward tendency
rvable since the end of the Civil War seems to have been
sted. When the war was over, the Union saved, and the
e of slavery gone for ever, there came a season of content-
t and of lassitude. A nation which had surmounted such
gers seemed to have nothing more to fear. Those who
fought with tongue and pen and rifle, might now rest on
r laurels. After long-continued strain and effort, the
ried nerve and muscle sought repose. It was repose from
tical warfare only. For the end of the war coincided with
opening of a time of swift material growth and abounding
erial prosperity, in which industry and the development
he West absorbed more and more of the energy of the peo-
Hence a neglect of the details of politics by the better
s of voters such as had never been seen before. The last
years have brought a revival of interest in public affairs,
especially in the management of cities. There is more
king and writing and thinking, practical and definite
king, upon the principles of government than at any pre-
s epoch. Good citizens are beginning to put their hands
he machinery of government; and it is noticed that those
do so are, more largely than formerly, young men, who
not contracted the bad habits which the practice of poli-
has engendered among many of their elders, and who will
few years have become an even more potent force than
are now. If the path to Congress and the State legisla-
s and the higher municipal offices were cleared of the
bling-blocks and dirt heaps which now encumber it, cun-
ly placed there by the professional politicians, a great
ge would soon pass upon the composition of legislative
es, and a new spirit be felt in the management of State
municipal as well as of national affairs.

CHAPTER LIX

PARTY ORGANIZATIONS

The Americans are, to use their favourite expression, a high executive people, with a greater ingenuity in inventing mea and a greater promptitude in adapting means to an end, th any European race. Nowhere are large undertakings organiz so skilfully; nowhere is there so much order with so mu complexity; nowhere such quickness in correcting a sudde discovered defect, in supplying a suddenly arisen demand.

Government by popular vote, both local and national, is ol in America than in continental Europe. It is far more compl than even in England. It deals with larger masses of m Its methods have engaged a greater share of attention, a enlisted more inventive skill in their service, than anywh else in the world. They have therefore become more elabor and, so far as mere mechanism goes, more perfect than elsewhe

The greatest discovery ever made in the art of war was wh men began to perceive that organization and discipline co for more than numbers. This discovery gave the Spar infantry a long career of victory in Greece, and the Sw infantry a not less brilliant renown in the later Middle Ag The Americans made a similar discovery in politics some f or sixty years ago. By degrees, for even in America gr truths do not burst full-grown upon the world, it was percei that the victories of the ballot-box, no less than of the swo must be won by the cohesion and disciplined docility of troops, and that these merits can only be secured by ski organization and long-continued training. Both parties fl themselves into the task, and the result has been an extren complicated system of party machinery, firm yet flexible, d cate yet quickly set up and capable of working well in roughest communities. Strong necessity, long practice, and

e competition of the two great parties, have enabled this utive people to surpass itself in the sphere of electioneering tics. Yet the principles are so simple that it will be the ator's fault if they are not understood.

ne preliminary word upon the object of a party organiza- To a European politician, by which I mean one who vs politics but does not know America, the aims of a party nization, be it local or general, seem to be four in number —

nion — to keep the party together and prevent it from wasting its strength by dissensions and schisms.

ecruiting — to bring in new voters, *e.g.* immigrants when they obtain citizenship, young men as they reach the age of suffrage, new-comers, or residents hitherto indifferent or hostile.

nthusiasm — to excite the voters by the sympathy of numbers and the sense of a common purpose, rousing them by speeches or literature.

struction — to give the voters some knowledge of the political issues they have to decide, to inform them of the virtues of their leaders, and the crimes of their opponents.

ese aims, or at least the first three of them, are pursued ne party organizations of America with eminent success. hey are less important than a fifth object which has been regarded in Europe, though in America it is the main- g of the whole mechanism. This is the selection of party idates; and it is important not only because the elective s are far more numerous than in any European country, ecause they are tenable for short terms, so that elections ently recur. Since the parties, having of late had no distinctive principles, and therefore no well-defined aims e direction of legislation or administration, exist practi- for the sake of filling certain offices, and carrying on the inery of government, the choice of those members of the whom the party is to reward, and who are to strengthen the winning of the offices, becomes a main end of its being. ere are three ways by which in self-governing countries dates may be brought before electors. One is for the date to offer himself, appealing to his fellow-citizens on trength of his personal merits, or family connections, or

wealth, or local influence. This was the practice in mo English constituencies till our own time; and seems to be t practice over parliamentary Europe still. It was not u common in the Southern States before the Civil War. Anoth is for a group or junto of influential men to put a candida forward, intriguing secretly for him or openly recommendi him to the electors. This also largely prevailed in Englan where, in counties, four or five of the chief landowners used agree as to the one of themselves who should stand for t county, or perhaps chose the eldest son of a duke or marquis the person whom rank designated.[1] So in Scotch burghs a ki of active bailies and other citizens combined to bring out candidate, but generally kept their action secret, for "t clique" was always a term of reproach. The practice is co mon in France now, where the committees of each party reco mend a candidate.

The third system is that in which the candidate is chos neither by himself nor by the self-elected local group, but the people themselves, *i.e.* by the members of a party, wheth assembled in mass or acting through representatives chosen the purpose. This plan offers several advantages. It promi to secure a good candidate, because presumably the people w choose a suitable man. It encourages the candidate, by givi him the weight of party support, and therefore tends to indu good men to come forward. It secures the union of the par because a previous vote has determined that the candidate the man whom the majority prefer, and the minority are the fore likely, having had their say and been fairly outvoted, fall into line and support him. This is the system which n prevails from Maine to California, and is indeed the keyst of trans-atlantic politics. But there is a further reason fo than those I have mentioned.

That no American dreams of offering himself for a post less he has been chosen by his party, or some section there is due not to the fact that few persons have the local p eminence which the social conditions of Europe bestow on

[1] Thus in Mr. Disraeli's novel of *Tancred* the county member, a ma good birth and large estates, offers to retire in order to make room for eldest son of the Duke when he comes of age. This would not happen n a-days, unless of course the duke were a party leader, and the county men desired to be rewarded by a peerage

ling landowners of a neighbourhood, or on some great mer-
nts or employers in a town, nor again to the modesty
ch makes an English candidate hesitate to appear as a
lidate for Parliament until he has got up a requisition to
self to stand, but to the notion that the popular mind and
are and must be all in all, that the people must not only
te the office-bearer by their votes, but even designate the
ons for whom votes may be given. For a man to put
self before the voters is deemed presumptuous, because an
oachment on their right to say whom they will even so
h as consider. The theory of popular sovereignty requires
the ruling majority must name its own standard-bearers
servants, the candidates, must define its own platform,
t in every way express its own mind and will. Were it to
e these matters to the initiative of candidates offering
nselves, or candidates put forward by an unauthorized
ue, it would subject itself to them, would be passive instead
ctive, would cease to be worshipped as the source of power.
ystem for selecting candidates is therefore not a mere con-
ance for preventing party dissensions, but an essential fea-
of matured democracy.

was not however till democracy came to maturity that the
em was perfected. As far back as the middle of last
ury it was the custom in Massachusetts, and probably in
r colonies, for a coterie of leading citizens to put forward
lidates for the offices of the town or colony, and their nomi-
ons, although clothed with no authority but that of the
viduals making them, were generally accepted. This lasted
fter the Revolution, for the structure of society still retained
rtain aristocratic quality. Clubs sprang up which, espe-
y in New York State, became the organs of groups and
ies, brought out candidates, and conducted election cam-
ns; while in New England the clergy and the men of
tance continued to act as leaders. Presently, as the
ocratic spirit grew, and people would no longer acquiesce
lf-appointed chiefs, the legislatures began to be recognized
ie bodies to make nominations for the higher Federal and
e offices. Each party in Congress nominated the candidate
e run for the presidency, each party in a State legislature
candidate for governor, and often for other places also.

This lasted during the first two or three decades of the preser century, till the electoral suffrage began to be generally lowered and a generation which had imbibed Jeffersonian principles ha come to manhood, a generation so filled with the spirit o democratic equality that it would recognize neither the natura leaders whom social position and superior intelligence ind cated, nor the official leadership of legislative bodies. As part struggles grew more bitter, a party organization became nece sary, which better satisfied the claims of petty local leader which knit the voters in each district together and concentrate their efforts, while it expressed the absolute equality of a voters, and the right of each to share in determining his cand date and his party platform. The building up of this ne organization was completed for the Democratic party about th year 1835, for the Whig party not till some years later. Whe the Republican party arose about 1854, it reproduced so closel or developed on lines so similar, the methods which experien had approved, that the differences between the systems of th two great parties are now unimportant, and may be disregarde in the sketch I have to give. It is not so much these diffe ences as the variations between the arrangements in cities an those in rural districts as well as between the arrangements different "Sections" of the country, that make it hard to pr sent a perfectly accurate and yet concise description.

The essential feature of the system is that it is from botto to top strictly representative. This is because it has powe and power can flow only from the people. An organizatio which exists, like the political associations of Britain, sole or mainly for the sake of canvassing, conducting registratio diffusing literature, getting up courses of lectures, holdi meetings and passing resolutions, has little or no powe Its object is to excite, or to persuade, or to manage such bus ness as the defective registration system of the country leav to be fulfilled by voluntary agencies. So too in America t committees or leagues which undertake to create or stimula opinion have no power, and need not be strictly representativ But when an organization which the party is in the habit obeying, chooses a party candidate, it exerts power, power oft of the highest import, because it practically narrows the cho of a party, that is, of about a half of the people, to one p

ılar person out of the many for whom they might be inclined vote.[1] Such power would not be yielded to any but a resentative body, and it is yielded to the bodies I shall cribe because they are, at least in theory, representative, l are therefore deemed to have the weight of the people ıind them.

The rapid change in the practice of England in this point is a curious ptom of the progress of democratic ideas and usages there. As late as general elections of 1868 and 1874, nearly all candidates offered themes to the constituency, though some professed to do so in pursuance of ıisitions emanating from the electors. In 1880 many—I think most—Liberal lidates in boroughs, and some in counties, were chosen by the local party ciations, and appealed to the Liberal electors on the ground of having ı so chosen. In 1885 and again in 1892, all or nearly all new Liberal candis were so chosen, and a man offering himself against the nominee of the ciation was denounced as an interloper and traitor to the party. The e process has been going on in the Tory party, though more slowly. The ıence of the locally wealthy, and also that of the central party office, is ewhat greater among the Tories, but in course of time choice by repreative associations will doubtless become the rule.

CHAPTER LX

THE MACHINE

The organization of an American party consists of two di
tinct, but intimately connected, sets of bodies, the one perm
nent, the other temporary. The function of the one is
manage party business, of the other to nominate party cand
dates.

The first of these is a system of managing committees.
some States every election district has such a committe
whose functions cover the political work of the district. Th
in country places there is a township committee, in cities
ward committee. There is a committee for every city, f
every district, and for every county. In other States it
only the larger areas, cities, counties, and Congressional
State Assembly districts that have committees. There is,
course, a committee for each State, with a general supervisi
of such political work as has to be done in the State as
whole. There is a National Committee for the political bus
ness of the party in the Union as a whole, and especially f
the presidential contest.[1] The whole country is covered
this network of committees, each with a sphere of action c
responding to some constituency or local election area, so th
the proper function of a city committee, for instance, is
attend to elections for city offices, of a ward committee
elections for ward offices, of a district committee to electio
for district offices. Of course the city committee, wh
supervising the general conduct of city elections, looks
each ward organization to give special attention to the el
tions in its own ward; and the State committee will in St

[1] Within the State Committees and National Committee there is a sm
Executive Committee which practically does most of the work and exerc
most of the power.

ctions expect similar help from, and be entitled to issue ections to, all bodies acting for the minor areas — districts, nties, townships, cities, and wards — comprised in the te. The smaller local committees are in fact autonomous their special local purposes, but subordinate in so far as y serve the larger purposes common to the whole party. e ordinary business of these committees is to raise and ly funds for election purposes and for political agitation erally, to organize meetings when necessary, to disseminate itical tracts and other information, to look after the press, ttend to the admission of immigrants as citizens and their olment on the party lists.[1] At election times they have to superintend the canvass, to procure and distribute kets at the polls, to allot money for various election ser-es; but they are often aided, or virtually superseded, in work by "campaign committees" specially created for the asion. Finally, they have to convoke at the proper times se nominating assemblies which form the other parallel but inct half of the party organization.

hese committees are permanent bodies, that is to say, they always in existence and capable of being called into activity short notice. They are re-appointed annually by the Pri-y (hereinafter described) or Convention (as the case may for their local area, and of course their composition may be pletely changed on a re-appointment. In practice it is little changed, the same men continuing to serve year after r, because they hold the strings in their hands, because know most and care most about the party business. In icular, the chairman is apt to be practically a permanent ial, and (if the committee be one for a populous area) a erful and important official, who has large sums to dis-e and quite an army of workers under his orders. The rmanship of the organizing committee of the county and of New York (these areas being the same), for instance, post of great responsibility and influence, in which high utive gifts find a worthy sphere for their exercise.

ne function and one only is beyond the competence of

[1] The business of registration is, I think, in all States undertaken by the c authority for the locality, instead of being, as in England, partially left e action of the individual citizen or of the parties.

these committees — the choice of candidates. That belong to the other branch of the organization, the nominating assemblies.

Every election district, by which I mean every local area o constituency which chooses a person for any office or post administrative, legislative, or judicial, has a party meetin to select the party candidate for that office. This is calle Nominating. If the district is not subdivided, *i.e.* does no contain any lesser districts, its meeting is called a Primary A primary has two duties. One is to select the candidate for its own local district offices. Thus in the country township primary[1] nominates the candidates for townshi offices, in a city a ward primary nominates those for war offices (if any). The other duty is to elect delegates to th nominating meetings of larger areas, such as the county c congressional district in which the township is situate, or th city to which the ward belongs. The primary is composed o all the party voters resident within the bounds of the town ship or ward. They are not too numerous, for in practice th majority do not attend, to meet in one room, and they ar assumed to be all alike interested. But as the party voters i such a large area as a county, congressional district, or city are too numerous to be able to meet and deliberate in on room, they usually act through representatives, and entrus the choice of candidates for office to a body called a Nomina ing Convention.[2] This body is composed of delegates from a the primaries within its limits, chosen at those primaries fo the sole purpose of sitting in the convention and of there selec ing the candidates.

Sometimes a convention of this kind has itself to choos delegates to proceed to a still higher convention for a large area. The greatest of all nominating bodies, that which called the National Convention and nominates the party ca

[1] I take township and ward as examples, but in parts of the country whe the township is not the unit of local government (see Chapter XLVIII. *ante* the local unit, whatever it is, must be substituted.

[2] Now, however, it sometimes happens that a primary is held for a whc Congressional district or city, the party voters voting at party polls (under statute) for the persons proposed for party candidates, just as they would vo at an election. In a recent [illegible] such city primary election at Louisville (Ky I find the primary treated by the local journals as being virtually the electi

ate for the presidency, is entirely composed of delegates
m other conventions, no primary being directly represented
it. As a rule, however, there are only two sets of nomi-
ing authorities, the primary which selects candidates for its
n petty offices, the convention composed of the delegates
m all the primaries in the local circumscriptions of the
trict for which the convention acts.

A primary, of course, sends delegates to a number of differ-
conventions, because its area, let us say the township or
rd, is included in a number of different election districts,
h of which has its own convention. Thus the same pri-
ry will in a city choose delegates to at least the following
ventions, and probably to one or two others.[1] (*a*) To the
convention, which nominates the mayor and other city
cers. (*b*) To the Assembly district convention, which nomi-
es candidates for the lower house of the State legislature.
To the senatorial district convention, which nominates
didates for the State Senate. (*d*) To the congressional
rict convention, which nominates candidates for Congress.
To the State convention, which nominates candidates for
governorship and other State offices. Sometimes, however,
nominating body for an Assembly district is a primary and
a convention. In New York City the Assembly district is
unit, and each of the thirty districts has its primary.

This seems complex: but it is a reflection of the complexity
government, there being everywhere three authorities, Fed-
, State, and Local (this last further subdivided), covering
same ground, yet the two former quite independent of one
ther, and the third for many purposes distinct from the
nd.

he course of business is as follows: — A township or ward
mary is summoned by the local party managing committee,
fix the hour and place of meeting, or if there be not such
mmittee, then by some permanent officer of the organi-
on in manner prescribed by the by-laws. A primary for
rger area is usually summoned by the county committee.

[1] There may be also a county convention for county offices, and a judicial
ict convention for judgeships, but in a large city or county the county
ention delegates may also be delegates to the congressional convention,
aps also to the State assembly district and senatorial district conventions.

If candidates have to be chosen for local offices, various names are submitted and either accepted without a division or put to the vote, the person who gets most votes being declared chosen to be the party candidate. He is said to have received the party nomination. The selection of delegates to the various conventions is conducted in the same way. The local committee has usually prepared beforehand a list of names of persons to be chosen to serve as delegates, but any voter present may bring forward other names. All names, if not accepted by general consent, are then voted on. At the close of the proceedings the chairman signs the list of delegates chosen to the approaching convention or conventions, if more than one, and adjourns the meeting *sine die*.

The delegates so chosen proceed in due course to their respective conventions, which are usually held a few days after the primaries, and a somewhat longer period before the elections for offices.[1] The convention is summoned by the managing committee for the district it exists for, and when a sufficient number of delegates are present, some one proposes a temporary chairman, or the delegate appointed for the purpose by the committee of the district for which the convention is being held "calls the meeting to order" as temporary chairman. This person names a Committee on Credentials, which forthwith examines the credentials presented by the delegates from the primaries, and admits those whom it deems duly accredited. Then a permanent chairman is proposed and placed in the chair, and the convention is held to be "organized," *i.e.* duly constituted. The managing committee have almost always arranged beforehand who shall be proposed as candidates for the party nominations, and their nominees are usually adopted. However, any delegate may propose any person he thinks fit, being a recognized member of the party, and carry him on a vote if he can. The person adopted by a majority of delegates' votes becomes the party candidate, having "received the nomination." The convention sometimes, but not always, also amuses itself by passing resolutions expressive of its political sentiments; or if

[1] In the case of elections to the Presidency and to the Governorship of a State the interval between the nominating convention and the election is much longer—in the former case about four months.

a State convention or a National convention, it adopts a atform, touching on, rather than dealing with, the main estions of the day. It then, having fulfilled its mission, journs *sine die*, and the rest of the election business falls to managing committee. It must be remembered that pri-ries and conventions, unlike the local party associations of gland, are convoked but once, make their nominations, and nish. They are swans which sing their one song and die. The national convention held every fourth year before a sidential election needs a fuller description, which I shall e presently. Meantime three features of the system just lined may be adverted to.

Every voter belonging to the party in the local area for which primary is held, is presumably entitled to appear and vote it. In rural districts, where everybody knows everybody e, there is no difficulty about admission, for if a Democrat ne into a Republican primary, or a Republican from North ams tried to vote in the Republican primary of Lafayette-le, he would be recognized as an intruder and expelled. But cities where people do not know their neighbours by head-rk, it becomes necessary to have regular lists of the party ers entitled to a voice in the primary. These are made up the local committee, which may exclude persons whom, ugh they call themselves Republicans (or Democrats, as the es may be), it deems not loyal members of the party. The al test is, Did the claimant vote the party ticket at the last portant election, generally the presidential election, or that the State governorship? If he did not, he may be excluded. quently, however, the local rules of the party require every admitted to the list of party voters to be admitted by the es of the existing members, who may reject him at their asure, and also exact from each member two pledges, to obey local committee, and to support the party nominations, the ach of either pledge being punishable by expulsion. In ny primaries voters supposed to be disagreeably independent kept out either by the votes of the existing members or the application of these strict tests. Thus it happens that ee-fourths or even four-fifths of the party voters in a pri-y area may not be on the lists and entitled to raise their ce in the primary for the selection of candidates or dele-

gates. Another regulation, restricting nominations to those who are enrolled members of the regular organization, makes persons so kept off the list ineligible as party candidates.

Every member of a nominating meeting, be it a primary or a convention of delegates, is deemed to be bound by the vote of the majority to support the candidate whom the majority select, whether or no an express pledge to that effect has been given. And in the case of a convention a delegate is generally held to bind those whom he represents, *i.e.* the voters at the primary which sent him. Of course no compulsion is possible, but long usage and an idea of fair play have created a sentiment of honour (so-called) and party loyalty strong enough with most people and in all but extreme cases, to secure for the party's candidate the support of the whole party organization in the district.[1] It is felt that the party must be kept together, and that he who has come into the nominating assembly hoping to carry his own candidate ought to obey the decision of the majority. The vote of a majority has a sacredness in America not yet reached in Europe.

As respects the freedom left to delegates to vote at their own pleasure or under the instructions of their primary, and to vote individually or as a solid body, the practice is not uniform. Sometimes they are sent up to the nominating convention without instructions, even without the obligation to "go solid." Sometimes they are expressly directed, or it is distinctly understood by them and by the primary, that they are to support the claims of a particular person to be selected as candidate, or that they are at any rate to vote altogether for one person. Occasionally they are even given a list arranged in order of preference, and told to vote for A. B., failing him for C. D., failing him for E. F., these being persons whose names have already been mentioned as probable candidates for the nomination. This, however, would only happen in the case of the greater offices, such as those of member of Congress or governor of a State. The point is in practice less important than it seems, because in most cases, whether there be any specific and avowed instruction or not, it is well settled beforehand by those who manage the choice of delegates what candidate and

[1] The obligation is however much less strict in the case of municipal elections, in which party considerations sometimes count for little.

of delegates are to support, or at least whose lead they are ollow in the nominating convention.

Tote further how complex is the machinery needed to enable party to concentrate its force in support of its candidates all these places, and how large the number of persons stituting the machinery. Three sets of offices, municipal ounty, State, Federal, have to be filled; three different sets ominating bodies are therefore needed. If we add together he members of all the conventions included in these three , the number of persons needed to serve as delegates will ound to reach a high total, even if some of them serve in e than one convention. Men whose time is valuable will se the post of delegate, gladly leaving to others who desire ie duty of selecting candidates for offices to which they sel- themselves aspire. However, as we shall see, such men but rarely permitted to become delegates, even when they re the function.

Why these tedious details?" the European reader may aim. "Of what consequence can they be compared to the stitution and laws of the country?" Patience. These ils have more significance and make more difference to the king of the government than many of the provisions of the stitution itself. The mariner feels the trade winds which ep over the surface of the Pacific and sees nothing of the l insects which are at work beneath its waves, but it is by labour of these insects that islands grow, and reefs are t up on which ships perish.

CHAPTER LXI

WHAT THE MACHINE HAS TO DO

The system I have described is simple in principle, and woul be simple in working if applied in a European country whe elective offices are few. The complexity which makes it puzz many Americans, and bewilder all Europeans, arises from th extraordinary number of elections to which it is applied, an from the way in which the conventions for different electio districts cross and overlap one another. A few instances ma serve to convey to the reader some impression of this profusio of elections and intricacy of nominating machinery.

In Europe a citizen rarely votes more than twice or thrice year, sometimes less often, and usually for only one person a time. Thus in England any householder, say at Manchest or Liverpool, votes once a year for a town councillor (if the is a contest); once in three years for members of a school boa (if there is a contest); once in four years (on an averag for a member of the House of Commons.[1] Allowing for th frequent cases in which there is no municipal contest in h ward, he will not on an average vote more than one and a ha times each year. It is much the same in Scotland, nor elections seem to be more frequent in France, Germany, Italy, or even perhaps in Switzerland.

Now compare the elections held to fill offices in the gre State of Ohio, which is fairly typical of the middle or old Western States. Citizens vote at the polls for the followi five sets of offices. For simplicity I take the case of a ci

[1] He may also vote once a year for guardians of the poor, but this office h been usually so little sought that the election excites slight interest and co paratively few persons vote. If he goes to a vestry meeting he may, in pla where there is a select vestry, vote for its members.

ead of a rural district, but the number of elective offices is rly the same in the latter.

. Federal Offices. — *Election held: — Once in every four rs* — Electors of the President of the United States. *Once very two years* — Members of the House of Representatives he United States.

I. State Offices. — *Once in each year* — Member of the rd of Public Works (to serve for three years); Judge of Supreme Court (to serve for five years). *Once in two years* Governor of the State of Ohio; Lieutenant-Governor of o; Secretary of State of Ohio; Treasurer of Ohio; Attorney-eral of Ohio; State Senators (elected in each Senatorial rict); Members of the State House of Representatives cted in each Representative district). *Once in three years* State Commissioner of Common Schools; Clerk of the Su-ne Court. *Once in four years* — Auditor of the State.

II. District Offices. — *Once in two years* — Circuit Judge serve for six years). *Once in five years* — Judge of the rt of Common Pleas (to serve for five years). *Once in ten rs* — Member of the State Board of Equalization.

V. County Offices. — *Once in each year* — County Com-sioner (to serve for three years); Infirmary Directors (to e for three years). *Once in two years* — County Treasurer; riff; Coroner. *Once in three years* — County Auditor; order; Surveyor; Judge of Probate; Clerk of Court of mon Pleas; Prosecuting Attorney.

. City Offices. — *Once in each year* — Members of the rd of Police Commissioners (in most cities); Members of rd of Infirmary Directors (to serve for three years); stee of Water Works (to serve for three years). *Once in years* — Mayor; City Clerk; Auditor (if any); Treasurer; citor; Police Judge (in large cities); Prosecuting Attorney he Police Court (in large cities); Clerk of Police Court large cities); City Commissioner (in cities of the second s); Marshal (not in the largest cities); Street Commis-er; Civil Engineer (if elected at the polls);[1] Fire Surveyor elected at the polls);[1] Superintendent of Markets (if ed at the polls).[1]

[1] The city council has power to determine whether these officers shall be nted by them or elected at the polls.

I have omitted from the above list —

All offices to which the council of a city appoints, because these are not conferred by popular election.

All unpaid elective offices (except presidential electors), although many of these furnish opportunities for gain and influence.[1]

All offices which are found only in one or both of the two great cities of Cincinnati and Cleveland.

This list shows a total of *seven* elections at the polls taking place annually, *twenty-one* to *twenty-six* (according to circumstances) taking place biennially, *eight* taking place triennially, *two* quadrennially, *one* quinquennially, *one* decennially, — giving an average in round numbers of twenty-two elections in each year. Of course this does not mean that there are twenty-two separate and distinct elections, for many of the State offices are filled up at one and the same election, as also most of the city offices at one and the same election. It means that there are, on an average, twenty-two different paid offices[2] which a voter has annually to allot by his vote — that is to say, he must in each and every year make up his mind as to the qualifications of twenty-two different persons or sets of persons to fill certain offices. As nearly all these offices are contested on political lines, though the respective principles (if any) of Republicans and Democrats have no more to do with the discharge of the duties of the State and local offices than the respective principles of Methodists and Baptists, nominations to them are made by the respective party organizations. Candidates for all, or nearly all, the above offices are nominated in conventions composed of delegates from primaries. I cannot give the precise number of conventions, but there must be at least seven or eight, although one or two of these will not be held every year. As the areas with their respective conventions overlap, the same primary will in each year send different

[1] The ward offices are omitted from the above list, because they are usually unpaid, and the township offices because they represent in the rural districts what the ward offices are in the towns. The candidates for ward and township offices are nominated in primaries.

[2] If the unpaid offices were included, the average would rise to about twenty-five, and some of these offices (*e.g.* that of Alderman) are fought on political lines because they give influence and patronage. The text therefore understates the case. In some cities the office of alderman is paid: in most it is much sought after.

ts of delegates to as many different nominating conventions, x or seven at least, as there are sets of offices to be filled up that year. The number and names of the elective offices ffer in different States of the Union, but the general features the system are similar.

Let us now take another illustration from Massachusetts, d regard the system from another side by observing how any sets of delegates a primary will have to send to the several minating conventions which cover the local area to which e primary belongs.[1]

A Massachusetts primary will choose the following sets of rsons, including committee-men, candidates, and delegates: —

1. Ward and city committees in cities, and town committees in towns.[2]
2. In cities, candidates for common council and board of aldermen; towns, candidates for town officers, *i.e.* selectmen, school committee, erseers of poor, town clerk and treasurer, assessors of taxes, etc.
3. In cities, delegates to a convention to nominate city officers.
4. Delegates to a convention to nominate county officers.
5. Candidates for representatives to State legislature, or delegates to onvention to nominate the same.
6. Delegates to a convention for nominating candidates for State nate.
7. Delegates to a convention for nominating candidates for State Gov- ior's council.
8. Delegates to a convention for nominating candidates for State ces (*e.g.* Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, etc.).

The above are annual. Then every two years —

9. Delegates to a congressional district convention for nominating ndidates for representatives to Congress.

Then every four years —

10. Delegates to a district convention for nominating other delegates rresponding to the members of Congress) to the national Presidential nvention of the party; and
11. Delegates to a general convention for nominating four delegates arge (corresponding to United States senators) to national Presidential nvention.[3]

I owe the following list, and the explanatory note at the end of the vol- e to the kindness of a friend in Massachusetts (Mr. G. Bradford of Boston), o has given much attention to the political methods of his country.

A "town" in New England is the unit of rural local government corre- nding to the township of the Middle and Western States. See Chapter VIII. *ante*.

See further the note to this chapter in the Appendix.

In New York City, at the November elections, there are usually from one hundred and sixty to two hundred candidates for the various offices, even when the year is not one of those when presidential electors are chosen; and all these have been nominated at primaries or conventions. But I need not weary the reader with further examples, for the facts above stated are fairly illustrative of what goes on over the whole Union.

It is hard to keep one's head through this mazy whirl of offices, elections, and nominating conventions. In America itself one finds few ordinary citizens who can state the details of the system, though these are of course familiar to professional politicians.

The first thing that strikes a European who contemplates this organization is the great mass of work it has to do. In Ohio, for instance, there are, if we count in such unpaid offices as are important in the eyes of politicians, on an average more than twenty-five offices to be filled annually by election. Primaries or conventions have to select candidates for all of these. Managing committees have to organize the primaries, "run" the conventions, conduct the elections. Here is ample occupation for a professional class.

What are the results which one may expect this abundance of offices and elections to produce?

The number of delegates needed being large, since there are so many conventions, it will be hard to find an adequate number of men of any mark or superior intelligence to act as delegates. The bulk will be persons unlikely to possess, still more unlikely to exercise, a careful or independent judgment. The function of delegate being in the case of most conventions humble and uninteresting, because the offices are unattractive to good men, persons whose time is valuable will not, even if they do exist in sufficient numbers, seek it. Hence the best citizens, *i.e.* the men of position and intelligence, will leave the field open to inferior persons who have any private or personal reason for desiring to become delegates. I do not mean to imply that there is necessarily any evil in this as regards most of the offices, but mention the fact to explain why few men of good social position think of the office of delegate except to the National Convention once in four years, as one of trust or honour.

The number of places to be filled by election being very ge, ordinary citizens will find it hard to form an opinion as the men best qualified for the offices. Their minds will be tracted among the multiplicity of places. In large cities ticularly, where people know little about their neighbours, names of most candidates will be unknown to them, and re will be no materials, except the recommendation of a ty organization, available for determining the respective ess of the candidates put forward by the several parties.

Most of the elected officials are poorly paid. Of those above merated in Ohio, none, not even the governor, receives more n $4000 (£800) a year, the majority very much less. The ies of most offices require no conspicuous ability, but can discharged by any honest man of good sense and business its. Hence they will not (unless where they carry large s or important patronage) be sought by persons of ability l energy, because such persons can do better for themselves private business; it will be hard to say which of the many didates is the best; the selection will rouse little stir among people at large.

Those who have had experience of public meetings know that make them go off well, it is as desirable to have the proceed- s prearranged as it is to have a play rehearsed. You must ect beforehand not only your chairman, but also your akers. Your resolutions must be ready framed; you must prepared to meet the case of an adverse resolution or hostile endment. This is still more advisable where the meeting ntended to transact some business, instead of merely express- its opinion; and when certain persons are to be selected any duty, prearrangement becomes not merely convenient indispensable in the interests of the meeting itself, and of business which it has to dispatch. "Does not prearrange- nt practically curtail the freedom of the meeting?" Cer- ly it does. But the alternative is confusion and a hasty onsidered decision. Crowds need to be led; if you do not them they will go astray, will follow the most plausible aker, will break into fractions and accomplish nothing. ace if a primary is to discharge properly its function of cting candidates for office or a number of delegates to a inating convention, it is necessary to have a list of candi-

dates or delegates settled beforehand. And for the reason already given, the more numerous the offices and the delegate and the less interesting the duties they have to discharge, s much the more necessary is it to have such lists settled; an so much the more likely to be accepted by those present is th list proposed.

The reasons have already been stated which make the list c candidates put forth by a primary or by a nominating conven tion carry great weight with the voters. They are the chose standard-bearers of the party. A European may remark tha the citizens are not bound by the nomination; they may sti vote for whom they will. If a bad candidate is nominated, h may be passed over. That is easy enough where, as in Eng land, there are only one or two offices to be filled at an electio where these few offices are important enough to excite gener interest, and where therefore the candidates are likely to b men of mark. But in America the offices are numerous, the are mostly unimportant, and the candidates are usually obscur Accordingly guidance is welcome, and the party as a whol votes for the person who receives the party nomination fro the organization authorized to express the party view. Hen the high importance attached to "getting the nomination" hence the care bestowed on constructing the nominating ma chinery; hence the need for prearranging the lists of delegat to be submitted to the primary, and of candidates to com before the convention.

I have sought in these chapters firstly to state how th nominating machine is constituted, and what work it has do, then to suggest some of the consequences which th quantity and nature of that work may be expected to entai We may now go on to see how in practice the work turns o to be done.

CHAPTER LXII

HOW THE MACHINE WORKS

NOTHING seems fairer or more conformable to the genius of ocratic institutions than the system I have described, reby the choice of party candidates for office is vested in mass of the party itself. A plan which selects the can- te likely to command the greatest support is calculated revent the dissension and consequent waste of strength ch the appearance of rival candidates of the same party lves; while the popular character of that method excludes dictation of a clique, and recognizes the sovereignty of the ple. It is a method simple, uniform, and agreeable ughout to its leading principle.

o understand how it actually works one must distinguish ween two kinds of constituencies or voting areas. One l is to be found in the great cities — places whose popula- exceeds, speaking roughly, 100,000 souls, of which there more than thirty in the Union. The other kind includes tituencies in small cities and rural districts. What I e to say will refer chiefly to the Northern States — *i.e.* the ner Free States, because the phenomena of the Southern es are still exceptional, owing to the vast population of rant negroes, among whom the whites, or rather the better of whites, still stand as an aristocracy.

ne tests by which one may try the results of the system of cting candidates are two. Is the choice of candidates for e really free — *i.e.* does it represent the unbiassed wish mind of the voters generally? Are the offices filled by of probity and capacity sufficient for the duties?

the country generally, *i.e.* in the rural districts and l cities, both these tests are tolerably well satisfied. It ue that many of the voters do not attend the primaries.

The selection of delegates and candidates is left to be mad by that section of the population which chiefly interests itsel in politics; and in this section local attorneys and office-seeker have much influence. The persons who seek the post of dele gate, as well as those who seek office, are seldom the mos energetic and intelligent citizens; but that is because suc men have something better to do. An observer from Europ who looks to see men of rank and culture holding the sam place in State and local government as they do in England especially rural England, or in Italy, or even in parts of rura France and Switzerland, will be disappointed. But democra cies must be democratic. Equality will have its perfect work and you cannot expect citizens pervaded by its spirit to go ca in hand to their richer neighbours begging them to act as dele gates, or city or county officials, or congressmen. This muc may be said, that although there is in America no differenc of rank in the European sense, superior wealth or intelligenc does not prejudice a man's candidature, and in most place improves its chance. If such men are not commonly chose it is for the same reason which makes them comparatively scarce among the town-councillors of English municipalities.

In these primaries and conventions the business is alway prearranged — that is to say, the local party committee com prepared with their list of delegates or candidates. This li is usually, but not invariably, accepted: or if serious oppos tion appears, alterations may be made to disarm it, and pr serve the unity of the party. The delegates and candidate chosen are generally the members of the local committee, the friends or creatures. Except in very small places, they a rarely the best men. But neither are they the worst. I moderately-sized communities men's characters are known ar the presence of a bad man in office brings on his fellow-citizen evils which they are not too numerous to feel individually. Hence tolerable nominations are made, the general sentimen of the locality is not outraged; and although the nominatin machinery is worked rather in the name of the people than b the people, the people are willing to have it so, knowing th they can interfere if necessary to prevent serious harm.

In large cities the results are different because the circum stances are different. We find there, besides the conditio

viously enumerated, viz. numerous offices, frequent elec-
ns, universal suffrage, an absence of stimulating issues,
ee others of great moment —

A vast population of ignorant immigrants.

The leading men all intensely occupied with business.

Communities so large that people know little of one another,
l that the interest of each individual in good government is
nparatively small.

Any one can see how these conditions affect the problem.
e immigrants vote, that is, they obtain votes after three or
r years' residence at most (often less), but they are not fit
the suffrage.[1] They know nothing of the institutions of
country, of its statesmen, of its political issues. Neither
m Central Europe nor from Ireland do they bring much
owledge of the methods of free government, and from Ire-
d they bring a suspicion of all government. Incompetent
give an intelligent vote, but soon finding that their vote has
alue, they fall into the hands of the party organizations,
ose officers enrol them in their lists, and undertake to fetch
m to the polls. I was taken to watch the process of citizen-
king in New York. Droves of squalid men, who looked
if they had just emerged from an emigrant ship, and had
haps done so only a few weeks before, for the law prescrib-
a certain term of residence is frequently violated, were
ught up to a magistrate by the ward agent of the party
ich had captured them, declared their allegiance to the
ited States, and were forthwith placed on the roll.[2] Such
acrifice of common sense to abstract principles has seldom
n made by any country. Nobody pretends that such per-
s are fit for civic duty, or will be dangerous if kept for a
e in pupilage, but neither party will incur the odium of pro-

[1] Federal law prescribes a residence of five years as the prerequisite for
ralization, but the laws of not a few Western States enable a vote to be
ired in a shorter term by one who is not a United States citizen. See
pter XXVIII. *ante*. And in some States, persons who have not completed
five years are often fraudulently naturalized.

[2] It is even alleged that many of the immigrants (especially Italians)
ght over to be employed on railroad making and other similar works
e under what are virtually contracts to cast their votes in a particular
and do so cast them, possibly returning to Europe after some months or
s, richer by the payment they have received for their votes as well as for
labour.

posing to exclude them. The real reason for admitting them besides democratic theory, was that the party which ruled New York expected to gain their votes.[1] It is an afterthought t argue that they will sooner become good citizens by being immediately made full citizens. A stranger must not presum to say that the Americans have been imprudent, but he ma doubt whether the possible ultimate gain compensates th direct and unquestionable mischief.

In these great transatlantic cities, population is far les settled and permanent than in the cities of Europe. In New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, a very small part of the inhabitants are natives of the city, or hav resided in it for twenty years. Hence they know but littl of one another, or even of those who would in Europe be calle the leading men. There are scarcely any old families, fami lies associated with the city,[2] whose name recommends one c their scions to the confidence of his fellow-citizens. Ther are few persons who have had any chance of becoming gener ally known, except through their wealth; and the wealth have neither time nor taste for political work. Political wor is a bigger and heavier affair than in small communities: henc ordinary citizens cannot attend to it in addition to their regu lar business. Moreover, the population is so large that an in dividual citizen feels himself a drop in the ocean. His powe of affecting public affairs by his own intervention seems insig nificant. His pecuniary loss through over-taxation, or job bery, or malversation, is trivial in comparison with the troubl of trying to prevent such evils.

As party machinery is in great cities most easily perverted so the temptation to pervert it is there strongest, because th prizes are great. The offices are well paid, the patronage large, the opportunities for jobs, commissions on contracts pickings, and even stealings, are enormous. Hence it is wel worth the while of unscrupulous men to gain control of th machinery by which these prizes may be won.[3]

[1] At one time a speedy admission to citizenship was adopted as an induc ment to immigrants; but this motive has ceased to have force in most State

[2] In New York and Boston a few such families still exist, but their mem bers do not often enter "politics."

[3] Although what is here stated is generally true of Machines in large citi there may be, even in such cities, districts inhabited by well-to-do people,

Such men, the professional politicians of the great cities, ve two objects in view. One is to seize the local city and unty offices. A great city of course controls the county in ich it is situate. The other is so to command the local party e as to make good terms with the party managers of the ate, and get from them a share in State offices, together with h legislation as is desired from the State legislature, and ilarly to make good terms with the Federal party managers, s securing a share in Federal offices, and the means of in- encing legislation in Congress. How do the city profession- move towards these objects?

There are two stages in an election campaign. The first is nominate the candidates you desire: the second to carry m at the polls. The first of these is often the more impor- t, because in many cities the party majority inclines so idedly one way or the other (*e.g.* New York City is steadily mocratic, Philadelphia Republican), that nomination is in case of the dominant party equivalent to election. Now nominate your candidates you must, above all things, secure primaries. They require and deserve unsparing exertion, everything turns upon them.

The first thing is to have the kind of primary you want. w the composition of a primary is determined by the roll or heck list," as it is called, of ward voters entitled to appear it. This is prepared by the managing committee of the rd, who are naturally desirous to have on it only such men they can trust or control. They are aided in securing this the rules requiring members to be admitted by the votes hose already on the list, and exacting from persons admitted ledge to obey the committee, and abide by the party nomi- ions.[1] Men of independent temper often refuse this pledge,

h the political organizations, being composed of men of good character standing, are honestly worked. The so-called " brown-stone districts " ew York City have, I believe, good Machines.

The rules of the Tammany Hall (Democratic) organization in New York have, for many years past, made the consent of a majority of the mem- of each primary necessary to the admission of a new member. A similar em seems to have been adopted by the Republican party in that city. "The nization of the twenty-four Republican primaries (one for each Assembly ict) is as complicated, and the access to membership as difficult, as that ny private club. The name of the applicant must be quoted on a bulletin, there stand until the next monthly meeting before it can even go to

and are excluded. Many of the ward voters do not apply f admission. Of those who do apply and take the pledge, so can be plausibly rejected by the primary on the ground th they have on some recent occasion failed to vote the par ticket. Thus it is easy for an active committee to obtain subservient primary, composed of persons in sympathy wi it or obedient to it. In point of fact the rolls of membersh of many primaries are largely bogus rolls. Names of form members are kept on when these men have left the district died: names are put on of men who do not belong to the d trict at all, and both sets of names are so much "voting stock applicable at the will and needs of the local party manage who can admit the latter to vote, and "recognize men" perso ating the former. In fact, their control of the lists enabl them to have practically whatever primary they desire.[1]

the committee on admissions. If favourably reported, it must yet gai majority of those present at a monthly meeting of the primary; a result qu problematical, if the pliant obedience of the candidate is not made clear, o he is not a member of the faction, or the follower of the boss dominant in primary; and his application must be to the primary of his district. If secures a majority he must yet not only take in substance the old Tamma pledge, 'to obey all orders of the general committee' (whose action is secr and 'to support all nominations approved by that committee,' but he m also bind himself not to join any organization which does not recognize authority of the primary association he seeks to join! This is of cou intended to prevent all movements for reform. If elected, he may at time be expelled by a majority of the members at any meeting of the asso tion, if he is held to have violated any of those pledges. After an expuls he can get back only by a vote of the primary." Mr. D. B. Eaton, in *Am Cyclop. of Polit. Science*, art. "Primary Elections." The Republicans ha however, within the last eight years reformed their system.

[1] In 1880 it was computed that out of 58,000 Republican voters in N York City not more than 6000, or 8000 at the most, were members of Republican organization, and entitled to vote in a primary.

The numbers present in a primary are sometimes very small. "At the Republican primaries in New York City only 8 per cent of the Republi electors took part. In only eight out of twenty-four districts did the perc age exceed 10, in some it was as low as 2 per cent. In the Twenty-first sembly District Tammany Primary, 116 delegates, to choose an Assem candidate, were elected by less than fifty voters. In the Sixth Assem District County Democracy Primary, less than 7 per cent of the Democr voters took part, and of those who did, sixty-nine in number, nearly fourth were election officers. The primary was held in a careless way i saloon while card-playing was going on." — Mr. A. C. Bernheim, in *Pol. Sci Quarterly* for March 1888.

A trustworthy correspondent writes to me from Philadelphia (1894), "Th is probably an average of 150 Republican voters to an election district.

The next thing is to get the delegates chosen whom you wish . The committee when it summons the primary settles in ret conclave the names of the delegates to be proposed, of urse selecting men it can trust, particularly office-holders nd to the party which has put them in, and "workers" om the prospect of office will keep faithful. When the eting assembles a chairman is suggested by the committee l usually accepted. Then the list of delegates, which the mmittee has brought down cut and dry, is put forward. If meeting is entirely composed of professionals, office- lders, and their friends, it is accepted without debate. If ponents are present, they may propose other names, but the cial majority is almost always sufficient to carry the offi- l list, and the chairman is prepared to exert, in favour of friends, his power of ruling points of order. In extreme es a disturbance will be got up, in the midst of which the irman may plausibly declare the official list carried, or the eting is adjourned in the hope that the opposition will not at the trouble of coming next time, a hope likely to be real- l, if the opposition consists of respectable citizens who like spending an evening in such company. Sometimes professionals will bring in roughs from other districts to ut down such opponents, and if necessary threaten them. e way or another the "regular" list of delegates is almost ariably carried against the "good citizens." When how- r there are two hostile factions of professionals, each anx- s to secure nominations for its friends, the struggle is rper and its issue more doubtful. Fraud is likely to be d on both sides; and fraud often provokes violence.[1] It is gnificant illustration of the difference between the party

age attendance at primaries is said to be about 12, which is approximately number of party servants necessary to manage the meeting under party ."

For a remarkable recent instance in Baltimore see the report of United es Civil Service Commissioner Roosevelt to the President, May 1, 1891. dding ballots" (composed of six or seven ballots folded together as if one) profusely used at these primary elections in the various wards of Balti- e. One of the witnesses examined, an employé of the Custom House, testified llows: "Each side cheats as much as it can in the primaries. Whoever gets judges wins. I do just the same as they do. They had two judges." . . . How do you do your cheating?" A. "Well, we do our cheating honour- If they catch us at it, it's all right: it's fair. I even carried the box e with me on one occasion . . . I have broken up more than one election."

system in America and Europe that in the former foul pl is quite as likely, and violence more likely, to occur at par nominating meetings than in the actual elections where tw opposing parties are confronted.

The scene now shifts to the Nominating Convention, whi is also summoned by the appropriate committee. When it "called to order" a temporary chairman is installed, the i portance of whose position consists in his having (usually) t naming of a committee on credentials, or contested seats, whi examines the titles of the delegates from the various primari to vote in the convention. Being himself in the interest the professionals, he names a committee in their interest, a this committee does what it can to exclude delegates who a suspected of an intention to oppose the candidates whom t professionals have prearranged. The primaries have almo always been so carefully packed, and so skilfully "run," th a majority of trusty delegates has been secured; but so times a few primaries have sent delegates belonging to anot faction of the party, or to some independent section of t party, and then there may be trouble. Occasionally two s of delegates appear, each claiming to represent their prima The dispute generally ends by the exclusion of the Indep dents or of the hostile faction, the committee discovering flaw in their credentials, but sometimes, though rarely, t case is so clear that they must be admitted. In doubtful ca a partisan chairman is valuable, for, as it is expressed, " is a solid 8 to 7 man all the time." When the credentials ha been examined the convention is deemed to be duly organiz a permanent chairman is appointed, and the business of no nating candidates proceeds. A spokesman of the profession proposes A. B. in a speech, dwelling on his services to party. If the convention has been properly packed, he nominated by acclamation. If there be a rival faction rep sented, or if independent citizens who dislike him have b sent up by some primary which the professionals have fai to secure, another candidate is proposed and a vote tak Here also there is often room for a partial chairman to in ence the result; here, as in the primary, a tumult or a ho pocus may in extreme cases be got up to enable the chairm to decide in favour of his allies.

Americans are, however, so well versed in the rules which vern public meetings, and so prepared to encounter all sorts tricks, that the managers do not consider success certain less they have a majority behind them. This they almost tainly have; at least it reflects discredit on their handling the primaries if they have not. The chief hope of an position therefore is not to carry its own candidate but so frighten the professionals as to make them abandon theirs, l substitute some less objectionable name. The candidate osen, who, ninety-nine times out of a hundred, is the person edetermined by the managers, becomes the party nominee, itled to the support of the whole party. He has received ne regular nomination." If there are other offices whereto ninations have to be made, the convention goes on to these, ich being despatched, it adjourns and disappears for ever.

I once witnessed such a convention, a State convention, held Rochester, N.Y., by the Democrats of New York State, at t time under the control of the Tammany Ring of New rk City. The most prominent figure was the famous Mr. lliam M. Tweed, then in the zenith of his power. There s, however, little or nothing in the public proceedings from ich an observer could learn anything of the subterranean ces at work. During the morning, a tremendous coming l going and chattering and clattering of crowds of men who ked at once sordid and flashy, faces shrewd but mean and metimes brutal, vulgar figures in good coats forming into all groups and talking eagerly, and then dissolving to form sh groups, a universal *camaraderie*, with no touch of friend- p about it; something between a betting-ring and the flags side the Liverpool Exchange. It reminded one of the arming of bees in tree boughs, a ceaseless humming and zzing which betokens immense excitement over proceedings ich the bystander does not comprehend. After some hours this settled down; the meeting was duly organized; eches were made, all dull and thinly declamatory, except by an eloquent Irishman; the candidates for State offices re proposed and carried by acclamation; and the business ed. Everything had evidently been prearranged; and the contented, if any there were, had been talked over during swarming hours.

After each of the greater conventions it is usual to hold o
or more public gatherings, at which the candidates chosen a
solemnly adopted by the crowd present, and rousing speech
are delivered. Such a gathering, called a "ratificatio
meeting, has no practical importance, being attended only
those prepared to support the nominations made. The can
date is now launched, and what remains is to win the electio

The above may be thought, as it is thought by many Ame
cans, a travesty of popular choice. Observing the form
consulting the voters, it substantially ignores them, and forc
on them persons whom they do not know, and would dislike
they knew them. It substitutes for the party voters general
a small number of professionals and their creatures, extrac
prearranged nominations from packed meetings, and calls th
consulting the pleasure of the sovereign people.

Yet every feature of the Machine is the result of pate
causes. The elective offices are so numerous that ordina
citizens cannot watch them, and cease to care who gets the
The conventions come so often that busy men cannot serve
them. The minor offices are so unattractive that able men
not stand for them. The primary lists are so contrived th
only a fraction of the party get on them; and of this fracti
many are too lazy or too busy or too careless to attend. T
mass of the voters are ignorant; knowing nothing about t
personal merits of the candidates, they are ready to follow th
leaders like sheep. Even the better class, however they m
grumble, are swayed by the inveterate habit of party loyal
and prefer a bad candidate of their own party to a (probal
no better) candidate of the other party. It is less trouble
put up with impure officials, costly city government, a jobbi
State legislature, an inferior sort of congressman, than to s
rifice one's own business in the effort to set things right. Th
the Machine works on, and grinds out places, power, and opp
tunities for illicit gain to those who manage it.

CHAPTER LXIII

RINGS AND BOSSES

This is the external aspect of the Machine; these the phenena which a visitor taken round to see a number of maries and Nominating Conventions would record. But reader will ask, How is the Machine run? What are the er springs that move it? What is the source of the power committees wield? What force of cohesion keeps leaders followers together? What kind of government prevails ong this army of professional politicians?

The source of power and the cohesive force is the desire for ce, and for office as a means of gain. This one cause is icient to account for everything, when it acts, as it does in se cities, under the condition of the suffrage of a host of orant and pliable voters.

Those who in great cities form the committees and work the chine are persons whose chief aim in life is to make their ng by office. Such a man generally begins by acquiring uence among a knot of voters who live in his neighbourd, or work under the same employer, or frequent the same g-shop or beer saloon, which perhaps he keeps himself. He omes a member of his primary, attends regularly, attaches self to some leader in that body, and is forward to render rice by voting as his leader wishes, and by doing duty at tions. He has entered the large and active class called, nically, "workers," or more affectionately, "the Boys." n he becomes conspicuous in the primary, being recognized controlling the votes of others — "owning them" is the nical term — and is chosen delegate to a convention. alty to the party there and continued service at elections k him out for further promotion. He is appointed to some

petty office in one of the city departments, and presently himself nominated for an elective office. By this time he ha also found his way on to the ward committee, whence by degree he rises to sit on the central committee, having carefully nurse his local connection and surrounded himself with a band adherents, who are called his "heelers," and whose loyalty him in the primary, secured by the hope of "something good gives weight to his words. Once a member of the centr committee he discovers what everybody who comes to th front discovers sooner or later, by how few persons the wor is governed. He is one of a small knot of persons who pu the wires for the whole city, controlling the primaries, selec ing candidates, "running" conventions, organizing election treating on behalf of the party in the city with the leaders the party in the State. Each of this knot, which is probab smaller than the committee, because every committee includ some ciphers put on to support a leader, and which may inclu one or two strong men not on the committee, has acquired his upward course a knowledge of men and their weaknesses, familiarity with the wheels, shafts, and bands of the par machine, together with a skill in working it. Each can co mand some primaries, each has attached to himself a group dependants who owe some place to him, or hope for some pla from him. The aim of the knot is not only to get good pos for themselves, but to rivet their yoke upon the city by ga risoning the departments with their own creatures, and controlling elections to the State legislature that they c procure such statutes as they desire, and prevent the passi of statutes likely to expose or injure them. They cement th dominion by combination, each placing his influence at t disposal of the others, and settle all important measures secret conclave.

Such a combination is called a Ring.

The power of such a combination is immense, for it ramif over the whole city. There are, in New York City, for instan over ten thousand persons employed by the city authoriti all dismissible by their superiors at short notice and witho cause assigned. There are over three thousand persons e ployed in the Custom-House, Post-Office, and other branch of the Federal service, most of whom are similarly dismissi

the proper Federal authority; and there are also State ants, responsible to and dismissible by the State authority. he same party happens to be supreme in city politics, in the eral government, and in the State government, all this y of employés is expected to work for the party leaders of city, in city primaries, conventions, and elections, and is ually amenable to the orders of these leaders.[1] If the er party holds the reins of Federal government, or of both Federal government and State government, then the city epullers have at any rate their own ten thousand or more, le other thousands swell the army of "workers" for the osite party. Add those who expect to get offices, and it be seen how great and how disciplined a force is avail- to garrison the city and how effective it becomes under ct discipline. Yet it is not larger than is needed, for the k is heavy. *Tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem.*

n a Ring there is usually some one person who holds more ngs in his hand than do the others. Like them he has ked himself up to power from small beginnings, gradually ending the range of his influence over the mass of workers, knitting close bonds with influential men outside as well nside politics, perhaps with great financiers or railway nates, whom he can oblige, and who can furnish him with ds. At length his superior skill, courage, and force of will te him, as such gifts always do make their possessor, domi- t among his fellows. An army led by a council seldom quers: it must have a commander-in-chief, who settles outes, decides in emergencies, inspires fear or attachment. head of the Ring is such a commander. He dispenses es, rewards the loyal, punishes the mutinous, concocts emes, negotiates treaties. He generally avoids publicity, ferring the substance to the pomp of power, and is all the e dangerous because he sits, like a spider, hidden in the st of his web. He is a Boss.

lthough the career I have sketched is that whereby most ses have risen to greatness, some attain it by a shorter path. re have been brilliant instances of persons stepping at once o the higher rungs of the ladder in virtue of their audacity

[1] Assuming, as one usually may, that the city leaders are on good terms with the Federal and State party managers.

and energy, especially if coupled with oratorical power. Th
first theatre of such a man's successes may have been the stum
rather than the primary: he will then become potent in co
ventions, and either by hectoring or by plausible address, f
both have their value, spring into popular favour, and mal
himself necessary to the party managers. It is of course a ga
to a Ring to have among them a man of popular gifts, becau
he helps to conceal the odious features of their rule, gilding
by his rhetoric, and winning the applause of the masses wh
stand outside the circle of workers. However, the position
the rhetorical boss is less firmly rooted than that of the intrig
ing boss, and there have been instances of his suddenly falli
to rise no more.

A great city is the best soil for the growth of a Boss, becau
it contains the largest masses of manageable voters as well
numerous offices and plentiful opportunities for jobbing. B
a whole State sometimes falls under the dominion of o
intriguer. To govern so large a territory needs high abilitie
and the State boss is always an able man, somewhat more of
politician, in the European sense, than a city boss need b
He dictates State nominations, and through his lieutenan
controls State and sometimes Congressional conventions, bei
in diplomatic relations with the chief city bosses and loc
rings in different parts of the State. His power over the
mainly springs from his influence with the Federal executi
and in Congress. He is usually, almost necessarily, a memb
of Congress, probably a senator, and can procure, or at any ra
can hinder, such legislation as the local leaders desire or d
like. The President cannot ignore him, and the Presiden
ministers, however little they may like him, find it wor
while to gratify him with Federal appointments for persons
recommends, because the local votes he controls may make
the difference to their own prospects of getting some day
nomination for the presidency. Thus he uses his Congressio
position to secure State influence, and his State influence
strengthen his Federal position. Sometimes however he
rebuffed by the powers at Washington and then his State tha
fly from him. Sometimes he quarrels with a powerful c
boss, and then honest men come by their own.

It must not be supposed that the members of Rings, or t

at Boss himself, are wicked men. They are the offspring
a system. Their morality is that of their surroundings.
y see a door open to wealth and power, and they walk in.
obligations of patriotism or duty to the public are not
egarded by them, for these obligations have never been
sent to their minds. A State boss is usually a native
erican and a person of some education, who avoids the
sser forms of corruption, though he has to wink at them
n practised by his friends. He may be a man of personal
grity.[1] A city boss is often of foreign birth and humble
in; he has grown up in an atmosphere of oaths and cock-
s: ideas of honour and purity are as strange to him as ideas
ut the nature of the currency and the incidence of taxation:
tics is merely a means for getting and distributing places.
hat," said an ingenuous delegate at one of the National
ventions at Chicago in 1880, "what are we here for except
offices?" It is no wonder if he helps himself from the city
sury and allows his minions to do so. Sometimes he does
rob, and, like Clive, wonders at his own moderation. And
the city Boss improves as he rises in the world. Like a tree
ving out of a dust heap, the higher he gets, the cleaner do
boughs and leaves become. America is a country where
arity is scaled off more easily than in England, and where
general air of good nature softens the asperities of power.
e city bosses are men from whose decorous exterior and
otrusive manners no one would divine either their sordid
nnings or their noxious trade. As for the State boss, whose
nts are probably greater to begin with, he must be of very
se metal if he does not take a certain polish from the
ety of Washington.

city Ring works somewhat as follows. When the annual
iennial city or State elections come round, its members
to discuss the apportionment of offices. Each may desire
ething for himself, unless indeed he is already fully pro-
d for, and anyhow desires something for his friends. The
mon sort are provided for with small places in the gift of
official, down to the place of a policeman or doorkeeper
nessenger, which is thought good enough for a common

[1] too a rural boss is often quite pure, and blameworthy rather for his
ruing methods than for his aims.

"ward worker." Better men receive clerkships or the promise of a place in the custom-house or post-office to be obtained from the Federal authorities. Men still more important aspire to the elective posts, seats in the State legislature, a city alder-manship or commissionership, perhaps even a seat in Congress. All the posts that will have to be filled at the coming elections are considered with the object of bringing out a party ticket, *i.e.* a list of candidates to be supported by the party at the polls when its various nominations have been successfully run through the proper conventions. Some leading man, or probably the Boss himself, sketches out an allotment of places; and when this allotment has been worked out fully, it results in a Slate, *i.e.* a complete draft list of candidates to be proposed for the various offices.[1] It may happen that the slate does not meet everybody's wishes. Some member of the ring or some local boss — most members of a ring are bosses each in his own district, as the members of a cabinet are heads of the departments of state, or as the cardinals are bishops of dioceses near Rome and priests and deacons of her parish churches — may complain that he and his friends have not been adequately provided for, and may demand more. In that case the slate will probably be modified a little to ensure good feeling and content; and will then be presented to the Convention.

But there is sometimes a more serious difficulty to surmount. A party in a State or city may be divided into two or more factions. Success in the election will be possible only by uniting these factions upon the same nominees for office. Occasionally the factions may each make its list and then come together in the party convention to fight out their differences. But the more prudent course is for the chiefs to arrange matters in a private conference. Each comes wishing to get the most he can for his clansmen, but feels the need for a compromise. By a process of "dickering" (*i.e.* bargaining

[1] A pleasant story is told of a former Boss of New York State, who sat with his vassals just before the convention, preparing the Slate. There were half a dozen or more State offices for which nominations were to be made. The names were with deliberation selected and set down, with the exception of the very unimportant place of State Prison Inspector. One of his subordinates ventured to call the attention of the Boss to what he supposed to be an inadvertence, and asked who was to be the man for that place, to which the great man answered, with an indulgent smile, "I guess we will leave *that* to the convention."

y way of barter), various offers and suggestions being made
ll round, a list is settled on which the high contracting parties
gree. This is a Deal, or Trade, a treaty which terminates
ostilities for the time, and brings about "harmony." The
st so settled is now a Slate, unless some discontented magnate
ojects and threatens to withdraw. To do so is called "break-
ng the slate." If such a "sore-head" persists, a schism may
llow, with horrible disaster to the party; but usually a new
ate is prepared and finally agreed upon. The accepted Slate
now ready to be turned by the Machine into a Ticket, and
othing further remains but the comparatively easy process of
etting the proper delegates chosen by packed primaries, and
nning the various parts of the ticket through the conventions
which the respective nominations belong. Internal dissen-
on among the chiefs is the one great danger; the party must
all hazards be kept together, for the power of a united party
enormous. It has not only a large but a thoroughly trained
d disciplined army in its office-holders and office-seekers;
d it can concentrate its force upon any point where opposition
threatened to the regular party nominations.[1] All these
fice-holders and office-seekers have not only the spirit of
lf-interest to rouse them, but the bridle of fear to check any
irrings of independence. Discipline is very strict in this
my. Even city politicians must have a moral code and moral
andard. It is not the code of an ordinary unprofessional
tizen. It does not forbid falsehood, or malversation, or ballot
uffing, or "repeating." But it denounces apathy or coward-
e, disobedience, and above all, treason to the party. Its
pical virtue is "solidity," unity of heart, mind, and effort
nong the workers, unquestioning loyalty to the party leaders,
d devotion to the party ticket. He who takes his own course
a Kicker or Bolter; and is punished not only sternly but
ndictively. The path of promotion is closed to him; he is
rned out of the primary, and forbidden to hope for a delegacy
a convention; he is dismissed from any office he holds which
e Ring can command. Dark stories are even told of a secret
lice which will pursue the culprit who has betrayed his party,

[1] As for instance by packing the primaries with its adherents from other
tricts, whom a partisan chairman or committee will suffer to come in and
e.

and of mysterious disappearances of men whose testimo
against the Ring was feared. Whether there is any found
tion for such tales I do not undertake to say. But true it
that the bond between the party chiefs and their followers
very close and very seldom broken. What the client was
his patron at Rome, what the vassal was to his lord in t
Middle Ages, that the heelers and workers are to their boss
these great transatlantic cities. They render a personal feud
service, which their suzerain repays with the gift of a live
hood; and the relation is all the more cordial because the lo
bestows what costs him nothing, while the vassal feels that
can keep his post only by the favour of the lord.

European readers must again be cautioned against drawi
for themselves too dark a picture of the Boss. He is not
demon. He is not regarded with horror even by those "go
citizens" who strive to shake off his yoke. He is not nec
sarily either corrupt or mendacious, though he grasps at pla
power, and wealth. He is a leader to whom certain peculi
social and political conditions have given a character dissimil
from the party leaders whom Europe knows. It is worth wh
to point out in what the dissimilarity consists.

A Boss needs fewer showy gifts than a European demagog
His special theatre is neither the halls of the legislature n
the platform, but the committee-room. A power of rough a
ready repartee, or a turn for florid declamation, will help hi
but he can dispense with both. What he needs are the arts
intrigue and that knowledge of men which teaches him wh
to bully, when to cajole, whom to attract by the hope of ga
whom by appeals to party loyalty. Nor are so-called "soc
gifts" unimportant. The lower sort of city politicians c
gregate in clubs and bar-rooms; and as much of the cohes
strength of the smaller party organizations arises from th
being also social bodies, so also much of the power which liq
dealers exercise is due to the fact that "heelers" and "worke
spend their evenings in drinking places, and that meetings
political purposes are held there. Of the 1007 primaries a
conventions of all parties held in New York City preparat
to the elections of 1884, 633 took place in liquor saloons.
Boss ought therefore to be hail fellow well met with those w
frequent these places, not fastidious in his tastes, fond o

rink and willing to stand one, jovial in manners, and ready
oblige even a humble friend.

The aim of a Boss is not so much fame as power, and power
ot so much over the conduct of affairs as over persons.
atronage is what he chiefly seeks, patronage understood in
e largest sense in which it covers the disposal of lucrative
ntracts and other modes of enrichment as well as salaried
aces. The dependants who surround him desire wealth, or
least a livelihood; his business is to find this for them, and
doing so he strengthens his own position.[1] It is as the
stower of riches that he holds his position, like the leader of
band of condottieri in the fifteenth century.

The interest of a Boss in political questions is usually quite
condary. Here and there one may be found who is a poli-
ian in the European sense, who, whether sincerely or not,
ofesses to be interested in some measure affecting the wel-
re of the country. But the attachment of the ringster is
ually given wholly to the concrete party, that is to the men
ho compose it, regarded as office-holders or office-seekers; and
ere is often not even a profession of zeal for any party doc-
ne. As a noted politician once happily observed, "There are
politics in politics." Among bosses, therefore, there is little
rmth of party spirit. The typical boss regards the boss of
e other party much as counsel for the plaintiff regards counsel
the defendant. They are professionally opposed, but not
cessarily personally hostile. Between bosses there need be
more enmity than results from the fact that the one has got
at the other wishes to have. Accordingly it sometimes
ppens that there is a good understanding between the chiefs
opposite parties in cities; they will even go the length of

[1] "A Boss is able to procure positions for many of his henchmen on horse-
roads, the elevated roads, quarry works, etc. Great corporations are pecu-
ly subject to the attacks of demagogues, and they find it greatly to their
rest to be on good terms with the leader in each district who controls the
e of the assemblyman and alderman; and therefore the former is pretty
e that a letter of recommendation from him on behalf of any applicant for
k will receive most favourable consideration. The leader also is continually
ping his supporters out of difficulties, pecuniary and otherwise: he lends
m a dollar now and then, helps out, when possible, such of their kinsmen
get into the clutches of the law, gets a hold over such of them as have done
ng and are afraid of being exposed, and learns to mix bullying judiciously
h the rendering of service." — Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, in the *Century*
gazine for Nov. 1886.

making a joint "deal," *i.e.* of arranging for a distribution offices whereby some of the friends of one shall get places, t residue being left for the friends of the other. A well-orga ized city party has usually a disposable vote which can be cast under the directions of the managers as to effect this, any other desired result. The appearance of hostility mu of course, be maintained for the benefit of the public; but it is for the interest of both parties to make and keep the private bargains, they are usually kept when made, though it seldom possible to prove the fact.

The real hostility of the Boss is not to the opposite par but to other factions within his own party. Often he has rival leading some other organization, and demanding, in spect of the votes which that organization controls, a share the good things going. The greatest cities can support m than one faction within the same party; thus New York h long three democratic organizations, two of which were pow ful and often angrily hostile. If neither can crush the oth it finds itself obliged to treat, and to consent to lose part of spoils to its rival. Still more bitter, however, is the hatred Boss and Ring towards those members of the party who do desire and are not to be appeased by a share of the spoils, who agitate for what they call reform. They are natural a permanent enemies; nothing but the extinction of the B himself and of bossdom altogether will satisfy them. Th are moreover the common enemies of both parties, that is, bossdom in both parties. Hence in ring-governed cities p fessionals of both parties will sometimes unite against reformers, or will rather let their opponents secure a pl than win it for themselves by the help of the "independ vote." Devotion to "party government," as they underst it, can hardly go farther.

This great army of workers is mobilized for elections, methods of which form a wide and instructive departmen political science. Here I refer only to their financial side, cause that is intimately connected with the Machine. E tions need money, in America a great deal of money. Whe then, does the money come, seeing that the politicians th selves belong to, or emerge from, a needy class?

The revenues of a Ring, that is, their collective, or, as

ay say, corporate revenues, available for party purposes, flow om five sources.

I. The first is public subscriptions. For important elections ich as the biennial elections of State officers, or perhaps for at of the State legislature, a "campaign fund," as it is called, raised by an appeal to wealthy members of the party. So rong is party feeling that many respond, even though they spect the men who compose the Ring, disapprove its methods, d have no great liking for the candidates.

II. Contributions are sometimes privately obtained from ch men who, though not directly connected with the Ring, ay expect something from its action. Contractors, for in- ance, have an interest in getting pieces of work from the city thorities. Railroad men have an interest in preventing State gislation hostile to their lines. Both, therefore, may be lling to help those who can so effectively help them. This urce of income is only available for important elections. Its cidental mischief in enabling wealth to control a legislature rough a Ring is serious.

III. An exceptionally audacious Ring will sometimes make surreptitious appropriation from the city or (more rarely) om the State treasury for the purposes not of the city or the ate, but of its own election funds. It is not thought pru- nt to bring such an appropriation[1] into the accounts to be d before the public; in fact, pains are taken to prevent the m from appearing, and the accounts have to be manipulated that purpose. The justification, if any, of conduct not au- orized by the law, must be sought in precedent, in the belief at the other side would do the same, and in the benefits ich the Ring expects to confer upon the city it administers. is a method of course available only when Ring officials ntrol the public funds, and cannot be resorted to by an position.

IV. A tax is levied upon the office-holders of the party, rying from one to four or even five per cent upon the amount their annual salaries. The aggregate annual salaries of the

[1] The practice of taking from Parliament a sum for secret service money, ch was formerly often applied by the government in power for electioneering poses, was extinguished in England in 1887. A sum is still voted for foreign et service. In England, however, the money was publicly voted each ses- , and though no account was rendered, it was well understood how it went.

city officials in New York City amounted in 1888 to $11,000,00
and those of the two thousand five hundred Federal official
who, if of the same party, might also be required to contri
ute,[1] to $2,500,000. An assessment at two per cent on thes
amounts would produce over $220,000 and $50,000 respe
tively, quite a respectable sum for election expenses in a si
gle city.[2] Even policemen in cities, even office boys an
workmen in Federal dockyards, have been assessed by the
party. As a tenant had in the days of feudalism to mak
occasional money payments to his lord in addition to th
military service he rendered, so now the American vassal mu
render his aids in money as well as give knightly service
the primaries, in the canvass, at the polls. His liabiliti
are indeed heavier than those of the feudal tenant, for th
latter could relieve himself from duty in the field by the pa
ment of scutage, while under the Machine a money payme
never discharges from the obligation to serve in the army
"workers." Forfeiture and the being proclaimed as "nit
ing," are, as in the days of the Anglo-Norman kings, the pe
alty for failure to discharge the duties by which the vass
holds. Efforts which began with an order issued by Pres
dent Hayes in 1877 applying to Federal offices, have be
made to prevent by administrative action and by legislati
the levying of this tribute on officials, but they have not
yet proved completely successful, for the subordinate fears
offend his superiors.

V. Another useful expedient might seem to have been bo
rowed from European monarchies in the sale of nominations a
occasionally of offices themselves.[3] A person who seeks to
nominated as candidate for one of the more important offic
such as a judgeship or a seat in the State Senate, or in Co
gress, is often required to contribute to the election fund a su
proportioned to the importance of the place he seeks, the excu
given for the practice being the cost of elections; and the sa

[1] Federal officials would, as a rule, contribute only to the fund for Fede
elections; but when the contest covered both Federal and city offices the fu
would be apt to be blended.

[2] To make the calculation complete we should have to reckon in also
(comparatively few) State officials and assessments payable by them.

[3] As judicial places were sold under the old French monarchy, and comm
sions in the army in England till 1872.

principle is occasionally applied to the gift of non-elective offices, the right of appointing to which is vested in some official member of a Ring — *e.g.* a mayor. The price of a nomination for a seat in the State legislature is said to run from $500 up to $1000, and for one of the better judgeships higher than $5000; but this is largely matter of conjecture.[1] Of course much less will be given if the prospects of carrying the election are doubtful: the prices quoted must be taken to represent cases where the large party majority makes success certain. Naturally, the salaries of officials have to be raised in order to enable them to bear this charge, so that in the long run it may be thrown upon the public; and a recent eminent boss of New York City defended, before a committee of the legislature, the large salaries paid to aldermen, on the ground that "heavy demands were made on them by their party."[2]

[1] "A judgeship," says Mr. F. W. Whitridge, "costs in New York about $15,000; the district attorneyship the same; for a nomination to Congress the price is about $4000, though this is variable; an aldermanic nomination is worth $1500, and that for the Assembly from $600 to $1500. The amount realized from these assessments cannot be exactly estimated, but the amount raised by Tammany Hall, which is the most complete political organization, may be fixed very nearly at $125,000 (£25,000). This amount is collected and expended by a small executive committee who keep no accounts and are responsible only to each other." — Article "Assessments," in *Amer. Cyclop. of Political Science.* In 1887, the City Chamberlain of New York estimated the average minimum assessment levied on a candidate for mayor at $20,000, for comptroller at $10,000, for district attorney at $5000. However, in 1887 the Democratic Rings in New York City demanded $25,000 for the nomination to the Comptrollership, and $5000 for that to a State Senatorship. The salary of the Comptroller is $10,000 for three years, that of Senator $1500 for two years, *i.e.* the senatorial candidate was expected to pay $2000 more than his total salary, a fact suggestive of expectations of gain from some other source.

[2] "Before a committee of the New York legislature the county clerk testified that his income was nearly $80,000 a year, but with refreshing frankness admitted that his own position was practically that of a figure-head, and that all the work was done by his deputy on a small fixed salary. As the county clerk's term is three years, he should nominally receive $240,000, but as a matter of fact two-thirds of the money probably goes to the political organizations with which he is connected." — Mr. T. Roosevelt in *Century* magazine for Nov. 1886. A county officer answered the same committee, when they put what was meant to be a formal question as to whether he performed his public duties faithfully, that he did so perform them whenever they did not conflict with his political duties! meaning thereby, as he explained, attending to his local organizations, seeing politicians, "fixing" primaries, bailing out those of his friends who were summoned to appear before a justice of peace, etc.

CHAPTER LXIV

LOCAL EXTENSION OF RINGS AND BOSSES

To determine the extent to which the Ring and Boss system sketched in the preceding chapters prevails over the United States would be difficult even for an American, because it would require a minute knowledge of the local affairs of all the States and cities. Much more, then, is it difficult for a European. I can do no more than indicate generally the results of the inquiries I have made, commending the details of the question to some future investigator.

It has been pointed out that rings and bosses are the product not of democracy, but of a particular form of democratic government, acting under certain peculiar conditions. They belong to democratic government, as the old logicians would say, not *simpliciter* but *secundum quid:* they are not of its essence, but are merely separable accidents. We have seen that these conditions are —

The existence of a Spoils System (= paid offices given and taken away for party reasons).

Opportunities for illicit gains arising out of the possession of office.

The presence of a mass of ignorant and pliable voters.

The insufficient participation in politics of the "good citizens."

If these be the true causes or conditions producing the phenomenon, we may expect to find it most fully developed in the places where the conditions exist in fullest measure, less so where they are more limited, absent where they do not exist.

A short examination of the facts will show that such is the case.

It may be thought that the Spoils System is a constant, existing everywhere, and therefore not admitting of the application of this method of concomitant variations. That system does no doubt prevail over every State of the Union, but it is not everywhere an equally potent factor, for in some cities the offices are much better paid than in others, and the revenues which their occupants control are larger. In some small communities the offices, or most of them, are not paid at all.[1] Hence this factor varies scarcely less than the others.

We may therefore say with truth that all of the four conditions above named are most fully present in great cities. Some of the offices are highly paid; many give facilities for lucrative jobbing; and the unpaid officers are sometimes the most apt to abuse these facilities. The voters are so numerous that a strong and active organization is needed to drill them; the majority so ignorant as to be easily led. The best citizens are engrossed in business and cannot give to political work the continuous attention it demands. Such are the phenomena of New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Brooklyn, St. Louis, Cincinnati, San Francisco, Baltimore, and New Orleans. In these cities Ring-and-bossdom has attained its amplest growth, overshadowing the whole field of politics.

Of the first two of these I need not speak in detail here, proposing to describe their phenomena in later chapters. Chicago, Baltimore, and New Orleans are little if at all better. I subjoin some remarks bearing on five other cities, with which I was (in 1887) favoured by leading citizens resident therein, in reply to interrogatories which I addressed to them. Knowing how apt a stranger is to imagine a greater uniformity than exists, I am anxious to enable the reader to understand to what extent the description I have given is generally true, and with what local diversities its general truth is compatible.

Cincinnati (Ohio), population in 1890, 296,908 —

"Our Ring is in a less formal shape than is sometimes seen, but dishonest men of both parties do in fact combine for common profits at the public expense. As regards a Boss, there is at this moment an interregnum, but some ambitious men are observed to be making progress towards that dignity. Rings are both the effect and the cause of pecu-

[1] For instance, the "selectmen" of a New England Town are not paid.

lation. They are the result of the general law of combination to furth the interest of the combiners.

"Where a Ring exists it can always exclude from office a good citize known to be hostile to it. But a good easy man who will not fight ar will make a reputable figure-head may be an excellent investment.

"The large cities are the great sufferers from the Spoils System, b cause in them power gives the greatest opportunity for profit and pecul tion. In them also it is easy to make a more or less open combinatic of keepers of tippling shops and the 'bummers,' etc., who congregate i them. Here, too, is the natural home of the class of vagabonds who wi profess devotion to the party or the man who will pay them, and wh combine to levy blackmail upon every candidate, and in turn are read to stuff ballot-boxes, to buy votes, to 'repeat,' etc. These scoundre 'live by politics' in their way, and force their services upon more prom nent men, till there comes to be a sort of 'solidarity' in which men national reputation find themselves morally compromised by bei obliged to recognize this sort of fraternity, and directly or indirectly make themselves responsible for the methods of these 'henchmen' a followers. They dare not break with this class because its enmity wou defeat their ambitions, and the more unscrupulous of them make fulle use of the co-operation, only rendering a little homage to decency b seeking to do it through intermediates, so as not too disgustingly to dir their own hands.

"In such a condition of things the cities become the prey of t 'criminal class' in politics, in order to ensure the discipline and orga ization in State and national politics which are necessary to the disti guished leaders for success. As a result it goes almost without sayi that every considerable city has its rings and its actual or would-be bosse There are occasional 'revolutions of the palace' in which bosses a deposed, or 'choked off,' because they are growing too fat on the spoi and there is no such permanence of tenure as to enable the uninitiat always to tell what boss or what ring is in power. They do not publi an *Almanach de Gotha*, but we feel and know that the process of plund continues. A man of genius in this way, like a Tweed or a Kelly, com occasionally to the front, but even in the absence of a ruler of this s the ward politicians can always tell where the decisive influences reside

"The *size* of the city in which the system reaches full bloom depen upon its business and general character. Small towns with a proportio ately large manufacturing population are better fields for rings than m homogeneous communities built up as centres of mercantile trade. T *tendency* however is to organize an official body of 'workers' in even t smallest community; and the selfishness of man naturally leads the doctrine that those who do the work shall live by it. Thus, from t profits of 'relation in office' and the exercise of intrigue and trick to g the place of the present incumbent, there is the *facilis descensus* to garding the profits of peculation and the plunder of the public as a leg mate corrective for the too slow accumulation from legal pay. Certa salaries and fees in most offices are notoriously kept high, so that

incumbent may freely 'bleed' for party use, or, what is the same thing, for the use of party 'bummers.' Thus we have had clerks of courts and sheriffs getting many times as much pay as the judges on the bench, etc. From this, jobbing in contracts, bribery, and unblushing stealing are reached by such easy steps that perhaps the local politician is hardly conscious of the progress in his moral education."

St. Louis (Missouri), population in 1890, 451,770 —

"There are always Rings in both parties more or less active according to circumstances.

"Two or perhaps three men are the recognized Bosses of the Democratic party (which is in the majority), one man of the Republican.

"The Rings are the cause of both peculation and jobbery, although St. Louis has had no 'big steal.'

"A good citizen seeking office would be excluded by the action of the Rings in our large cities, except in times of excitement, when good people are aroused to a proper sense of duty."[1]

Louisville (Kentucky), population in 1890, 161,129 —

"It can hardly be said that there is a regular Ring in Louisville. There are corrupt combinations, but they are continually shifting. The higher places in these combinations are occupied by Democrats, these being the ruling party, but they always contain some Republicans.

"The only Boss there is in Louisville to-day is the Louisville Gas Company. It works mainly through the Democratic party, as it is easier to bribe the 'Republican' negroes into the support of Democratic candidates than white Democrats to support Republicans.

"There is very little peculation in Kentucky now — no great disclosure for over five years; but there is a great deal of jobbery.

"The effect of the combinations is of course towards excluding good and capable men from office and to make room for mere favourites and local politicians."[2]

Minneapolis (Minnesota), population in 1890, 164,738 (?) —

"There has been for several years past a very disreputable Ring, which has come into power by capturing the machinery of the Democratic party, through (1) diligent work in the ward caucuses; (2) by its active alliance with the liquor dealers, gamblers, and so forth, and the support of 'lewd fellows of the baser sort,' regardless of national political preferences; (3) by a skilful and plausible championship of 'labor' and a capture of the labor vote.

"The Boss of this gang is thoroughly disliked and distrusted by the responsible and reputable element of his party in Minnesota, but they

[1] My correspondent writes in 1892 that the above remarks are still equally applicable. Both parties remain under a despotic Ring rule.

[2] The condition of Louisville was substantially the same in 1893.

tolerate him on account of his popularity and because they cannot break him down. He has operated chiefly through control of the police system. Instead of suppressing gambling houses, for example, he has allowed several of them to run under police protection, himself sharing in their large gains. Until recently the liquor saloon licenses have been $500 (£100) a year. He and the heads of the police department have allowed a number of places to retail liquor somewhat secretly outside the police patrol limits, within which we restrict the liquor traffic and from these illicit publicans the Ring has collected large sums of money.

"The Ring has seemed to control the majority in the Common Council, but the system of direct taxation and of checking expenditure is so open, and the scrutiny of the press and public so constant, that there has been little opportunity for actual plunder. In the awarding of contracts there is sometimes a savour of jobbery, and several of the councilmen are not above taking bribes. But they have been able to do comparatively little mischief; in fact, nothing outrageous has occurred outside of the police department. The Ring has lately obtained control of the (elective) Park Board, and some disreputable jobs have resulted. So there have been malpractices in the department of health and hospitals, in the management of the water system and in the giving away of a street railway franchise. But we are not a badly-plundered city by any means and we have just succeeded in taking the control of the police out of the hands of the Ring officials and vested it in a Metropolitan Police Board with excellent results. Two of the Ring are now under indictment of the county grand jury for malpractices in office."

St. Paul (Minnesota), population in 1890, 133,156 (?)—

"There is no regular Ring in St. Paul. It has for many years been in the hands of a clique of municipal Democratic politicians, who are fairly good citizens, and have committed no very outrageous depredations. The city is run upon a narrow partisan plan, but in its main policies and expenditures the views of leading citizens as formulated in the Chamber of Commerce almost invariably prevail.

"The Rings of Western cities (adds my informant) are not deliberately organized for plunder or jobbery. They grow out of our party politics. Certain of the worst elements of a party find that their superior diligence and skill in the manipulation of precinct and ward caucuses put them in control of the local machinery of their party organization. The success of their party gives them control of municipal affairs. They are generally men who are not engaged in successful trade or professional life, and make city politics their business. They soon find it profitable to engage in various small schemes and jobs for profit, but do not usually perpetrate anything very bold or bad."

I have taken the two cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul because they illustrate the differences which one often finds

between places whose population and other conditions seem very similar. The centres of these two cities are only ten miles apart; their suburbs are already beginning to touch. Minneapolis is younger, and has grown far more rapidly, and the manufacturing element in its population is larger. But in most respects it resembles its elder sister — they are extremely jealous of one another — so closely that an Old World observer who has not realized the swiftness with which phenomena come and go in the West is surprised to find the political maladies of the one so much graver than those of the other.

So stood things in 1887. In 1893 they had changed for the better in both cities. The Boss of Minneapolis had vanished, and the party opposed to that he had adorned was in power. The municipal administration, if not free from reproach, was comparatively free from scandals. St. Paul showed a marked improvement. A mayor had been elected on a "reform ticket," and the municipal clique formerly dominant had been broken up. But no one could feel sure that these gains would be preserved. Six years hence both cities may have relapsed, or the contrast that 1887 showed between them may have reappeared.[1] The great city of San Francisco, capital of the "Pacific slope," with a population of 300,000 people, was for years ruled by a boss who, through an energetic lieutenant, commanded the Fire Department of the city, and used its 350 paid employés as a sort of prætorian guard. He controlled the city elections, dominated the officials, was a power in State politics, tampered with the administration of the criminal law. At last steps were taken to have him and his grand vizir indicted for peculation, whereupon they both fled to Canada, and the city escaped the yoke. But the conditions which produced bossdom remaining, other and scarcely less audacious bosses soon arose, and now, according to the latest information I have been able to secure, the too heedless taxpayers are being plundered in the old fashion.

In cities of the second rank (say from ten thousand to one hundred thousand inhabitants) some of the same mischiefs

[1] I have just been informed (May, 1894) that the "reform" party has been defeated at the last election in St. Paul, and it is feared that the relapse contemplated in the text will now follow.

exist, but on a smaller scale. The opportunities for jobbin are limited. The offices are moderately paid. The popula tion of new immigrants, politically incompetent, and therefor easily pervertible, bears a smaller ratio to the native Amer cans. The men most prominent by their wealth or capacit are more likely to be known to the mass of the voters, an may have more leisure to join in local politics. Hence although we find rings in many of these cities, they are les powerful, less audacious, less corrupt. There are, of course differences between one city and another, differences some times explicable by its history and the character of its popu lation. A very high authority writes me from Michigan, State above the average —

"I have heard no charge of the reign of Bosses or Rings for the 'pu poses of peculation' in any of the cities or towns of Michigan or Indian or indeed in more than a few of our cities generally, and those for th most part are the large cities. In certain cases rings or bosses have ma aged political campaigns for partisan purposes, and sometimes to such a extent, say in Detroit (population in 1890, 205,876), that good citizer have been excluded from office or have declined to run. But robbe was not the aim of the rings. In not a few of our cities the liquor-salo keepers have combined to 'run politics' so as to gain control and secu a municipal management friendly to them. That is in part the explan tion of the great uprising of the Prohibition party."

The cities of New York State seem to suffer more tha those of New England or the West. Albany (a place 95,000 people) has long groaned under its bosses, but as th seat of the New York legislature it is a focus of intrigu Buffalo (with 255,000) has a large Irish and German popul tion. Rochester and Troy are ruled by local cliques; th latter is full of fellows who go to serve as "repeaters" Albany elections. Syracuse (88,000) is smaller and bett than Rochester, but has of late years shown some serio symptoms of the same disease. Cleveland is a larger pla than any of these, but having, like the rest of Northe Ohio, a better quality of population, its rings have nev carried things with a high hand, nor stolen public mone The same may be said of Milwaukee and of such New Engla cities as Providence, Augusta, Hartford, Worcester, Lowe The system more or less exists in all these, but the boss

ıave not ventured to exclude respectable outsiders from office, ıor have they robbed the city, debauched the legislature, re-ained their power by election frauds after the manner of their reat models in New York and Philadelphia. And this seems o hold true also of the Western and Southern cities of moder-te size. A seaside suburb of one great Eastern city lately roduced a singularly audacious boss, who combined that osition with those of head of the police and superintendent f the principal Sunday school. He had tampered freely with he election returns, giving his support sometimes to one arty, sometimes to another, and had apparently been able to turn over" the vote of the place at his pleasure. A rising f the "good citizens" has at last succeeded in procuring his onviction and imprisonment for election offences.

As regards Ohio a judicious authority says —

"Rings are much less likely to exist in the smaller cities, though a opulation of 30,000 or 40,000 may occasionally support them. We should ardly find them in a city below 10,000: any corruption there would be ccasional, not systematic."

From Missouri I am informed that —

"We have few or no Rings in cities under 60,000 inhabitants. The naller cities are not favourable to such kinds of control. Men know ie another too well. There is no large floating irresponsible following in large cities."

similar answer from Kentucky adds that Rings have never-eless been heard of in cities so small as Lexington (22,000 habitants) and Frankfort (8500).

In quite small towns and in the rural districts — in fact, herever there is not a municipality, but government is either a town meeting and selectmen or by township or county icials — the dangerous conditions are reduced to their mini-ım. The new immigrants are not generally planted in large asses but scattered among the native population, whose habits d modes of thinking they soon acquire. The Germans and andinavians who settle in the country districts have been ong the best of their race, and form a valuable element. ie country voter, whether native or foreign, is exposed to wer temptations than his brother of the city, and is less easy

either to lead or to drive. He is parsimonious, and pays his county or town officials on a niggardly scale. A boss has therefore no occupation in such a place. His talents would be wasted. If a ring exists in a small city it is little more than a clique of local lawyers who combine to get hold of the local offices, each in his turn, and to secure a seat for one of themselves in the State legislature, where there may be pickings to be had. It is not easy to draw the line between such a clique, which one may find all the world over, and a true Ring: but by whichever name we call the weed, it does little harm to the crop. Here and there, however, one meets with a genuine Boss even in these seats of rural innocence. I know a New England Town, with a population of about ten thousand people, which has long been ruled by such a local wirepuller. I do not think he steals. But he has gathered a party of voters round him, by whose help he carries the offices, and gets a chance of perpetrating jobs which enrich himself and supply work for his supporters. The circumstances, however, are exceptional. Within the taxing area of the Town there lie many villas of wealthy merchants, who do business in a neighbouring city, but are taxed on their summer residences here. Hence the funds which this Town has to deal with are much larger than would be the case in most towns of its size, while many of the rich tax-payers are not citizens here, but vote in the city where they live during the winter.[1] Hence they cannot go to the town meeting to beard the boss, but must grin and pay while they watch his gambols.

Speaking generally, the country places and the smaller cities are not ring-ridden. There is a tendency everywhere for the local party organizations to fall into the hands of a few men, perhaps of one man. But this happens not so much from an intent to exclude others and misuse power, as because the work is left to those who have some sort of interest in doing it, that, namely, of being themselves nominated to an office. Such persons are seldom professional office-seekers, but lawyers, farmers, or store-keepers, who are glad to add something to

[1] It will be remembered that in the United States, though a man may pay taxes on his real estate in any number of States or counties or cities, he can vote, even in purely local elections or on purely local matters, in one place only — that in which he is held to reside.

eir income, and have the importance, not so contemptible in village, of sitting in the State legislature. Nor does much rm result. The administration is fairly good; the tax-payers e not robbed. If a leading citizen, who does not belong to e managing circle, wishes to get a nomination, he will probly succeed; in fact, no one will care to exclude him. In any places there is a non-party "citizens' committee" which kes things out of the hands of the two organizations by nning as candidates respectable men irrespective of party. ch candidates generally succeed if the local party managers ve offended public sentiment by bad nominations. In short, e materials for real ring government do not exist, and its ethods are inapplicable, outside the large cities. No one eds to fear it, or does fear it.

What has been said refers chiefly to the Northern, Middle, d Western States. The circumstances of the South are difrent, but they illustrate equally well the general laws of ring owth. In the Southern cities there is scarcely any population European immigrants. The lowest class consists of negroes d "poor whites." The negroes are ignorant, and would be ngerously plastic material in the hands of unscrupulous repullers, as was amply shown after the Civil War. But ey have hitherto mostly belonged to the Republican party, d the Democratic party has so completely regained its cendency that the bosses who controlled the negro vote can nothing. In most parts of the South the men of ability and nding have interested themselves in politics so far as to tate the lines of party action. Their position when self-vernment was restored and the carpet-baggers had to be erthrown forced them to exertions. Sometimes they use or erate a ring, but they do not suffer it to do serious mischief, d it is usually glad to nominate one of them, or any one om they recommend. The old traditions of social leadership rvive better in the South than in the North, so that the orer part of the white population is more apt to follow the ggestions of eminent local citizens and to place them at its ad when they will accept the position. Moreover, the South a comparatively poor country. Less is to be gained from ce (including membership of a legislature), either in the y of salary or indirectly through jobbing contracts or

influencing legislation. The prizes in the profession of politic being fewer, the profession is not prosecuted with the sam earnestness and perfection of organization. There are, how ever, some cities where conditions similar to those of larg Northern cities reappear, and there Ring-and-bossdom reap pears also. New Orleans is the best example, and in Arkansa and Texas, where there never was a plantation aristocracy lik that of the Slave States on the Atlantic coast, rings are pretty numerous, though, as the cities are small and seldom rich their exploits attract little attention.

CHAPTER LXV

SPOILS

An illustration of the familiar dictum regarding the wisdom with which the world is governed may be found in the fact that the greatest changes are often those introduced with the least notion of their consequence, and the most fatal those which encounter least resistance. So the system of removals from Federal office which began some sixty-five years ago, though disapproved of by several among the leading statesmen of the time, including Clay, Webster, and Calhoun, excited comparatively little attention in the country, nor did its advocates foresee a tithe of its far-reaching results.

The Constitution vests the right of appointing to Federal offices in the President, requiring the consent of the Senate in the case of the more important, and permitting Congress to vest the appointment of inferior officers in the President alone, in the courts, or in the heads of departments. It was assumed that this clause gave officials a tenure at the pleasure of the President — *i.e.* that he had the legal right of removing them without cause assigned. But the earlier Presidents considered the tenure as being practically for life or during good behaviour, and did not remove, except for some solid reason, persons appointed by their predecessors. Washington in his eight years displaced only nine persons, and all for cause, John Adams nine in four years, and those not on political grounds. Jefferson in his eight years removed thirty-nine, but many of these were persons whom Adams had unfairly put in just before quitting office; and in the twenty years that followed (1808–28) there were but sixteen removals. In 1820, however, a bill was run through Congress with hardly any discussion, fixing four years as the term for a large number of the more important offices, and making those terms expire shortly after the inau-

guration of a President. This was ominous of evil, and called forth the strong displeasure of both Jefferson and Madison. The President, however, and his heads of departments did not remove, so the tenure of good behaviour generally remained. But a new era began with the hot and heady Jackson, who reached the presidential chair in 1829. He was a rough Western, a man of the people, borne into power by a popular movement, incensed against all who were connected with his predecessor, a warm friend and a bitter enemy, anxious to repay services rendered to himself. Penetrated by extreme theories of equality, he proclaimed in his Message that rotation in office was a principle in the Republican creed, and obeyed both his doctrine and his passions by displacing five hundred post-masters in his first year, and appointing partisans in their room. The plan of using office as a mere engine in partisan warfare had already been tried in New York, where the stress of party contests had led to an early development of many devices in party organization; and it was a New York adherent of Jackson, Marcy, who, speaking in the Senate in 1832, condensed the new doctrine in a phrase that has become famous —"To the victor belong the spoils."[1]

From 1828 to a few years ago the rule with both parties has been that on a change of President nearly all Federal offices, from the legations to European Courts down to village post-masterships, are deemed to be vacant. The present holders may of course be continued or reappointed (if their term has expired); and if the new President belongs to the same party as his predecessor, many of them will be; but they are not held to have either a legal or a moral claim. The choice of the President or departmental head has been absolutely free, no qualifications, except the citizenship of the nominee, being required, nor any check imposed on him, except that the Senate's consent is needed to the more important posts.[2]

[1] Before 1820 Governor Clinton complained "of an organized and disciplined corps of Federal officials interfering in State elections." Marcy's speech was a defence of the system of partisan removals and short terms from the example of his own State. "They [the New York politicians] when contending for victory avow the intention of enjoying the fruits of it. They see nothing wrong in the rule that to the victor belong the spoils of the enemy."

[2] See on this subject, Chapter V. in Vol. I.

The Act of 1820 as extended by subsequent legislation now covers about

The want of knowledge on the part of the President and his ministers of the persons who applied for places at a distance, obliged them to seek information and advice from those who, belonging to the neighbourhood, could give it. It was natural for the senators from a State or the representative in Congress from a district within which a vacant office lay, to recommend to the President candidates for it, natural for the President or his ministers to be guided by this recommendation, of course, in both cases, only when they belonged to the same party as the President. Thus the executive became accustomed to admit the rights which the politicians claimed, and suffered its patronage to be prostituted to the purpose of rewarding local party service and conciliating local party support. Now and then a President, or a strong Minister controlling the President, has proved restive; yet the usage continues, being grounded on the natural wish of the executive to have the good-will and help of the senators in getting treaties and appointments confirmed, and on the feeling that the party in every district must be strengthened by a distribution of good things, in the way which the local leader thinks most serviceable. The essential features of the system are, that a place in the public service is held at the absolute pleasure of the appointing authority; that it is invariably bestowed from party motives on a party man, as a reward for party services (whether of the appointee or of some one who pushes him); that no man expects to hold it any longer than his party holds power; and that this gives him the strongest personal reasons for fighting in the party ranks. Thus the conception of office among politicians came to be not the ideal one, of its involving a duty to the community, nor the "practical" one, of its being a snug berth in which a man may live if he does not positively neglect his work, but the perverted one, of its being a salary paid in respect of party services, past, present, and future.

The politicians, however, could hardly have riveted this system on the country but for certain notions which had become current among the mass of the people. "Rotation in office" was, and indeed by most men still is, held to be con-

000 offices. Its mischief, however, is not confined to the legal vacating of hese posts, but has lain largely also in establishing a custom applying to a ar larger number of minor places.

formable to the genius of a democracy. It gives every man an equal chance of power and salary, resembling herein the Athenian and Florentine system of choosing officers by lot. It is supposed to stimulate men to exertion, to foster a laudable ambition to serve the country or the neighbourhood, to prevent the growth of an official caste, with its habits of routine, its stiffness, its arrogance. It recognizes that equality which is so dear to the American mind, bidding an official remember that he is the servant of the people and not their master, like the bureaucrats of Europe. It forbids him to fancy that he has any right to be where he is, any ground for expecting to stay there. It ministers in an odd kind of way to that fondness for novelty and change in persons and surroundings which is natural in the constantly-moving communities of the West. The habit which grew up of electing State and city officers for short terms tended in the same direction. If those whom the people itself chose were to hold office only for a year or two, why should those who were appointed by Federal authority have a more stable tenure? And the use of patronage for political purposes was further justified by the example of England, whose government was believed by the Americans of fifty years ago to be worked, as in last century it largely was worked, by the Patronage Secretary of the Treasury in his function of distributing places to members of the House of Commons, and honours (such as orders of knighthood and steps in the peerage) to members of the House of Lords, ecclesiastical preferments to the relatives of both.[1]

Another and a potent reason why the rotation plan commended itself to the Americans is to be found in the belief that one man is as good as another, and will do well enough any work you set him to, a belief happily expressed by their old enemy King George the Third when he said that "every man is good enough for any place he can get." In America a smart man is expected to be able to do anything that he turns his hand to, and the fact that a man has worked himself into a place is some evidence of his smartness. He is a "practical man." This is at bottom George the Third's idea;

[1] Now of course the tables have been turned, and the examples of the practically irremovable English civil service and of the competitive entrance examinations in England are cited against the American system.

f you are clever enough to make people give you a place, you are clever enough to discharge its duties, or to conceal the fact that you are not discharging them. It may be added that most of these Federal places, and those which come most before the eyes of the ordinary citizen, require little special fitness. Any careful and honest man does fairly well for a side-waiter or a lighthouse keeper. Able and active men had no great interest in advocating appointment by merit or security of tenure, for they seldom wanted places themselves; and they had, or thought they had, an interest in jobbing their poor relatives and unprosperous friends into the public service. It is true that the relative or friend ran the risk of being turned out. But hope is stronger than fear. The prospect of getting a place affects ten people for one who is affected by the prospect of losing it, for aspirants are many and places relatively few.

Hitherto we have been considering Federal offices only, the immense majority whereof are such petty posts as those of postmaster in a village, custom-house officer at a seaport, and so forth, although they also include clerkships in the departments at Washington, foreign ambassadorships and consulates, and governorships of the Territories. The system of rotation had, however, laid such a hold on the mind of the country that it soon extended itself over State offices and city offices also, in so far as such offices remained appointive, and were not, like the higher administrative posts and (in most of the States and the larger cities) the judicial offices, handed over to popular election. Thus, down to that very recent time of which I shall speak presently, appointment by favour and tenure at the pleasure of the appointer became the rule in every sphere and branch of government, National, State, and municipal. It may seem strange that a people so eminently practical as the Americans acquiesced in a system which perverts public office from its proper function of serving the public, destroys the prospect of that skill which comes with experience, and gives nobody the least security that he will gain a higher post, or even retain the one he holds, by displaying conspicuous efficiency. The explanation is that administration used to be conducted in a happy-go-lucky way, that the citizens, accustomed to help themselves, relied very little on their functionaries, and did not care whether

they were skilful or not, and that it was so easy and so com
mon for a man who fell out of one kind of business to take t
and make his living by another, that deprivation seemed t
involve little hardship. However, the main reason was tha
there was no party and no set of persons specially interested i
putting an end to the system, whereas there soon came to be
set specially concerned to defend it. It developed, I migh
almost say created, the class of professional politicians, an
they maintained it, because it exactly suited them. That grea
and growing volume of political work to be done in managin
primaries, conventions, and elections for the city, State, an
National governments, whereof I have already spoken, an
which the advance of democratic sentiment and the needs o
party warfare evolved from 1820 down to about 1850, neede
men who should give to it constant and undivided attentio
These men the plan of rotation in office provided. Person
who had nothing to gain for themselves would soon have tire
of the work. The members of a permanent civil service woul
have had no motive for interfering in politics, because the polit
cal defeat of a public officer's friends would have left his pos
tion the same as before, and the civil service not being all o
one party, but composed of persons appointed at different time
by executives of different hues, would not have acted togethe
as a whole. Those, however, whose bread and butter depen
on their party may be trusted to work for their party, to enli
recruits, look after the organization, play electioneering trick
from which ordinary party spirit might recoil. The class o
professional politicians was therefore the first crop which th
Spoils System, the system of using public office as private priz
of war, bore. Bosses were the second crop. In the old Sca
dinavian poetry the special title of the king or chieftain is "th
giver of rings." He attracts followers and rewards the service
whether of the warrior or the skald, by liberal gifts. So th
Boss wins and holds power by the bestowal of patronag
Places are the guerdon of victory in election warfare; h
divides this spoil before as well as after the battle, promisin
the higher elective offices to the strongest among his fightin
men, and dispensing the minor appointive offices which lie
his own gift, or that of his lieutenants, to combatants of le
note but equal loyalty. Thus the chieftain consolidates, extend

ortifies his power by rewarding his supporters. He garrisons he outposts with his squires and henchmen, who are bound ast to him by the hope of getting something more, and the ear of losing what they have. Most of these appointive offices re too poorly paid to attract able men; but they form a step- ing-stone to the higher ones obtained by popular election; nd the desire to get them and keep them provides that numer- us rank and file which the American system requires to work ne Machine. In a country like England office is an object of esire to a few prominent men, but only to a few, because the laces which are vacated on a change of government are less nan sixty in all, while vacancies in other places happen only y death or promotion. Hence an insignificant number of per- ons out of the whole population have a personal pecuniary nterest in the triumph of their party. In England, therefore, ne has what may be called the general officers and headquar- ers staff of an army of professional politicians, but few subal- erns and no privates. And in England most of these general fficers are rich men, independent of official salaries. In merica the privates are proportioned in number to the offi- ers. They are a great host. As nearly all live by politics, ney are held together by a strong personal motive. When neir party is kept out of the spoils of the Federal government, s the Democrats were out from 1861 to 1885, they have a econd chance in the State spoils, a third chance in the city oils; and the prospect of winning at least one of these two tter sets of places maintains their discipline and whets their petite, however slight may be their chance of capturing the ederal offices.

It is these spoilsmen who have depraved and distorted the echanism of politics. It is they who pack the primaries and n the conventions so as to destroy the freedom of popular oice, they who contrive and execute the election frauds which sgrace some States and cities, — repeating and ballot stuffing, struction of the polls, and fraudulent countings in.[1]

In making every administrative appointment a matter of rty claim and personal favour, the system has lowered the

[1] The fact that in Canada the civil service is permanent has doubtless much do with the absence of such a regular party Machine as the United States ssess.

general tone of public morals, for it has taught men to neglect the interests of the community, and made insincerity ripen into cynicism. Nobody supposes that merit has anything to do with promotion, or believes the pretext alleged for an appointment. Politics has been turned into the art of distributing salaries so as to secure the maximum of support from friends with the minimum of offence to opponents. To this art able men have been forced to bend their minds: on this Presidents and ministers have spent those hours which were demanded by the real problems of the country.[1] The rising politician must think of obscure supporters seeking petty places as well as of those greater appointments by which his knowledge of men and his honesty deserve to be judged. It is hardly a caricature when, in Mr. Lowell's satire, the intending presidential candidate writes to his maritime friend in New England, —

> "If you git me inside the White House,
> Your head with ile I'll kinder 'nint,
> By gittin' you inside the light-house,
> Down to the end of Jaalam pint."

After this, it seems a small thing to add that rotation in office has not improved the quality of the civil service. Men selected for their services at elections or in primaries have not proved the most capable servants of the public. As most of the posts they fill need nothing more than such ordinary business qualities as the average American possesses, the mischief has not come home to the citizens generally, but it has sometimes been serious in the higher grades, such as the departments at Washington and some of the greater custom-houses. Moreover, the official is not free to attend to his official duties. More important, because more influential on his fortunes, is the duty to his party of looking after its interests at the election and his duty to his chiefs, the Boss and Ring, of seeing that the candidate they favour gets the party nomination. Such

[1] President Garfield said "one-third of the working hours of senators and representatives is scarcely sufficient to meet the demands in reference to the appointments to office. . . . With a judicious system of civil service, the business of the departments could be better done at half the cost."

[2] Sometimes the evil was so much felt that a subordinate of experience was always retained for the sake of teaching those who came in by political favour how to carry on the work.

an official, whom democratic theory seeks to remind of his dependence on the public, does not feel himself bound to the public, but to the city boss or senator or congressman who has procured his appointment. Gratitude, duty, service, are all for the patron. So far from making the official zealous in the performance of his functions, insecurity of tenure has discouraged sedulous application to work, since it is not by such application that office is retained and promotion won. The administration of some among the public departments in Federal and city government is more behind that of private enterprises than is the case in European countries; the ingenuity and executive talent which the nation justly boasts, are least visible in national or municipal business. In short, the civil service is not in America, and cannot, under the system of rotation, become a career. Place-hunting is the career, and an office is not a public trust, but a means of requiting party services, and also, under the method of assessments previously described, a source whence party funds may be raised for election purposes.

Some of these evils were observed as far back as 1853, when an Act was passed by Congress requiring clerks appointed to the departments at Washington to pass a qualifying examination.[1] Neither this nor subsequent legislative efforts in the same direction produced any improvement, for the men in office who ought to have given effect to the law were hostile to it. Similar causes defeated the system of competitive examination, inaugurated by an Act of Congress in 1871, when the present agitation for civil service reform had begun to lay hold of the public mind. Mr. Hayes (1877–81) was the first President who seems to have honestly desired to reform the civil service, but the opposition of the politicians, and the indifference of Congress, which had legislated merely in deference to the pressure of enlightened opinion outside, proved too much for him. A real step in advance was, however, made in 1883, by the passage of the so-called Pendleton Act, which instituted a board of civil service commissioners (to be named by the President), directing them to apply a system of com-

[1] To have made places tenable during good behaviour would have been open the objection that it might prevent the dismissal of incompetent men against whom no specific charge could be proved.

petitive examinations to a considerable number of offices in th departments at Washington, and a smaller number in oth parts of the country. President Arthur named a good co mission, and under the rules framed by it some good w effected. The action of the two succeeding Presidents h been matter of recent controversy; but while admitting th less has been done in the way of reform than might have bee desired, it is no less true that much more has been done tha it would have been safe to expect fifteen years ago. In t so-called "classified service," to which the examination syste is applied, some removals for political reasons are still occ sionally made, but the percentage is far smaller than in t unclassified service, and the Civil Service Commissioners see justified in the view they expressed in their report of 189 that "either outside the classified service poorer grades appointments are made, or else there are many removals perfectly good men who are sacrificed simply for party or pe sonal considerations. Probably both these conclusions wou be just."

The Act of 1883 originally applied to only 14,000 posts. has since been so extended as now to apply to about 43,0 out of a total estimated at 130,000 posts in the national civ service; and the salaries of those covered by it amount to on half of the total sum paid in salaries by the government. I moral effect, however, has been even greater than this propo tion represents, and entitles it to the description given of at the time as "a sad blow to the pessimists." Public sen ment is more and more favourable, and though the lower sc of "professionals" are incensed at so great an interferen with their methods, all, or nearly all, the leading men in bo parties seem now disposed to support it. It strengthens t hands of any President who may desire reform, and has stim lated the civil service reform movement in States and muni palities. Several States have now instituted examinations f admission to their civil service; and similar legislation h been applied to New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Bosto and other cities. Some years must pass before the result these changes upon the purification of politics can be fair judged. It is for the present enough to say that while t state of things above described has been generally true bo

Federal and of State and city administration during the last
xty years, there is now reason to hope that the practice of
ppointing for short terms, and of refusing to reappoint, or of
smissing in order to fill vacancies with political adherents,
as been shaken. Nor can it be doubted that the extension of
xaminations will tend more and more to exclude mere spoils-
en from the public service.

CHAPTER LXVI

ELECTIONS AND THEIR MACHINERY

I CANNOT attempt to describe the complicated and varyi
election laws of the different States. But the methods
conducting elections have so largely influenced the develo
ment of Machine politics, and the recent changes in them ha
made so much stir and seem likely to have such considerab
results, that the subject must not pass unnoticed.

All expenses of preparing the polling places and of payi
the clerks and other election officers who receive and cou
the votes, are borne by the community, not (as in Britai
by the candidates.

All elections, whether for city, State, or Federal offices, a
in all States conducted by ballot, which, however, was intr
duced, and was long regarded, not so much as a device f
preventing bribery or intimidation, but rather as the quicke
and easiest mode of taking the votes of a multitude. Secre
had not been specially aimed at, nor in point of fact general
secured.

An election is a far more complicated affair in America th
in Europe. The number of elective offices is greater, and
terms of office are shorter, the number of offices to be vot
for in any given year is much greater. To save the expen
of numerous distinct pollings, it has been usual, though by
means universal, to take the pollings for a variety of offices
the same time, that is to say, to elect Federal officials (pre
dential electors and congressmen), State officials, county o
cials, and city officials on one and the same day and at t
same polling booths. Presidential electors are chosen on
once in four years, congressmen once in two. But the numb
of State and county and city places to be filled is so large th
a voter seldom goes to the polling booth without having

cast his vote for at least eight or ten persons, candidates for different offices, and sometimes he may vote for twenty or thirty.

This gave rise to the system of slip tickets. A slip ticket is a list, printed on a long strip of paper, of the persons standing in the same interest, that is to say, recommended by the same party or political group for the posts to be filled up at any election.[1] Till very recently, the universal practice was for each such voting ticket to be printed and issued by a party organization, and to be then distributed at the polling booths by the party agents to the voters and placed by them in the box. The voter usually voted the ticket as he received it, that is to say, he voted *en bloc* for all the names it contained. It was indeed open to him to modify it by striking out certain names ("scratching") and writing in others, or by placing over a name a bit of paper, gummed at the back for the purpose (called a "paster"), on which was printed the name of some other candidate. But the always potent tendency to vote the party list as a whole was naturally stronger when that whole list found itself on the same piece of paper in the voter's hands than it would have been had the paper contained in alphabetical order the names of all the candidates whomsoever, making it necessary to pick and choose among them. This, however, was the least of the evils incident to the system. When (as often happened) the two great parties had bad names on their respective State or city tickets, the obvious remedy was the formation of a "Citizens'" or "Independent" organization to run better men. The heavy expense of printing and distributing the tickets was a serious obstacle to the making of such independent nominations, while the "regular" ticket distributors did all in their power to impede the distribution of these "independent tickets," and generally to confuse and mislead the independent voter. The expenses which the regular parties had to bear were made by their leaders a pretext for levying "election assessments" on candidates, and thereby (see *ante*, p. 118) of virtually selling nominations. And, finally, the absence of secrecy, for the voter could be followed by watchful eyes from the moment when he received the party

[1] A ticket includes more names or fewer, according to the number of offices to be filled, but usually more than a dozen.

ticket from the party distributor till he dropped it into th box, opened a wide door to bribery and intimidation. A grow ing sense of these mischiefs roused at length the zeal o reformers. In 1885 a bill for the introduction of a reall secret ballot was presented to the legislature of Michigan and in 1888 such a measure, resembling in its outlines th ballot laws of Australia and those of the United Kingdom, wa enacted in Massachusetts. The unprecedented scale on whic money was illegitimately used in the presidential election o 1888 provoked general alarm, and strengthened the hand of reformers so much that secret, or, as they are called "Australian," ballot laws are now in force in all the State except seven; viz., North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia Louisiana, Florida, Texas, Idaho, all (except the last) State in the South, a part of the country where reforms mak their way more slowly, and where one party has so marked predominance that a provision for fair elections may seem matter of less urgency than in the more equally divide Northern States. It may cause surprise that communities which live in alarm at the large negro vote should not seiz so simple a method of virtually excluding the bulk of tha vote, but the reason is doubtless to be found in the fact that secret ballot, unaccompanied by provisions for illiterate voters would also exclude a considerable number of whites. How ever, these seven States will probably ere long follow thei sisters in the enactment of secret ballot laws, and the strengt of the movement is witnessed by the fact that in three State Mississippi, Texas, and Kentucky, provisions on the subjec have been embodied in the constitutions, though, in the cas of Texas, the legislature has not yet given effect to them b statute.

The new laws of these thirty-seven States are of varyin merit. As might be expected from the character of the legislatures, those of New York, Connecticut, and New Jerse are the worst. Nearly all the laws, however, provide for th official printing of the voting papers, for the inclusion of th names of all candidates upon the same paper, so that the vot must himself place his mark against those he desires to suppor and for the depositing of the paper in the box by the voter such manner as to protect him from observation. Thus secre

as been nearly everywhere secured, and while independent andidates have a better chance, a heavy blow has been struck t bribery and intimidation. The practice of "peddling" the allots at the polling place by the agents of the parties, which ad reached portentous dimensions in New York, has in most laces disappeared, while the extinction of the head of expenses ncurred for this purpose, as well as for ballot printing, has iminished the pretext for levying assessments. Elections re far more orderly than they were, because more secret, and ecause the attendant crowd of those who peddle and hang bout the polls, disposed to turbulence and ready for intimida- on, has been much reduced. And it is an incidental gain nat the most ignorant class of voters, who in the North are sually recent immigrants, have been in some States deprived f their votes, in others stimulated (as has happened to the ore intelligent negroes in parts of the South) to improve eir education, and fit themselves to vote. Even where pro- sion is made for the voting of illiterates, a certain disgrace, hich citizens desire to escape, attaches to him who is forced to ave recourse to this provision. The presidential election of 892, conducted in thirty-five States under these new laws, has proved their superiority to the old system, and has further ncouraged the reformers, who have been surprised to find ow rapidly success has crowned their efforts. For a final dgment, however, we must wait until time has shown how r the ingenuity of corrupt politicians may devise methods for rading the salutary provisions of the new statutes.

So much for what may be called the machinery of voting. here are, however, several other questions that may be asked garding an election system. One is, whether it is honestly rried out by the officials? To this question no general swer can be given, because there are the widest possible fferences between different States; differences due chiefly to e variations in their election laws, but partly also to the ndition of the public conscience. In some States the official nduct of elections is now believed to be absolutely pure, ving, one is told, to the excellence of a minutely careful law. others, frauds, such as ballot stuffing and false counting, e said to be common, not only in city, but also in State and ederal elections. I have no data to determine how widely

frauds prevail, for their existence can rarely be proved, a they often escape detection. They are sometimes suspect where they do not exist. It is however clear that in so States they are frequent enough to constitute a serious proach.[1]

Another question is: Does the election machinery preve intimidation, bribery, personation, repeating, and the oth frauds which the agents of candidates or parties seek to per trate? Here, too, there are great differences between o State and city and another, differences due both to the la and to the character of the population. Of intimidation the is now but little, save in a few cities, where roughs, or oc sionally even the police, are said to molest a voter supposed belong to the other party, or to be inclined to desert their o party. But till the enactment of the secret ballot laws, sometimes happened that employers endeavoured to se their workingmen to the polls in a body in order to secu their votes; and the dislike to this was one of the motiv which obtained popular favour for these laws. Repeating a personation are not rare in dense populations, where the age and officials do not, and cannot, know the voters' faces; a these frauds are sometimes organized on a grand scale bringing bands of roughs from one city to another.

Bribery is a sporadic disease, but often intense when occurs. Most parts of the Union are pure, as pure as Scotla where from 1868 till 1892 there was only one election petiti for alleged bribery. Other parts are no better than the sm boroughs of Southern England were before the Corrupt Pr tices Act of 1883.[2] No place, however, not even the poor

[1] They were specially frequent, and are not extinct, in some of the South States, being there used to prevent the negro voters from returning Republi candidates. It was here that the use of "tissue ballots" was most comm I was told in San Francisco that elections had become more pure since introduction of glass ballot boxes, which made it difficult for the presid officials to stock the ballot box with voting papers before the voting bega the morning. After the election of 1893, nearly 100 election officers in N York City, about 25 in Brooklyn, and a good many in the smaller cities w indicted for offences against the election laws, and especially for permitt "repeaters" to vote, for accompanying voters into the booth on a false tence of their blindness or physical incapacity, and for cheating in the cou ing of the votes. Many were convicted.

[2] The British general election of 1880 gave rise to no less than 95 petitions pugning returns on the ground of some form of corruption, and many were

ard in New York City, sinks below the level of such constit-encies as Yarmouth, or Sandwich, used to be in England. Bribery is seldom practised in America in the same way as it sed to be at Rome, by distributing small sums among a large ass of poor electors, or even, as in many English boroughs, mong a section of voters (not always the poorest) known to be enal, and accustomed to reserve their votes till shortly before ie close of the poll. The American practice has been to give ums of from $20 to $50 to an active local "worker," who ndertakes to bring up a certain number of voters, perhaps wenty or thirty, whom he "owns" or can get at. He is not equired to account for the money, and spends a comparatively mall part of it in direct bribes, though something in drinks to ie lower sort of elector. This kind of expenditure belongs o the category rather of paid canvassing than of bribery, yet ometimes the true European species occurs. In a New Hampshire rural town not long ago, $10 were paid to each of wo hundred doubtful voters. In some districts of New York ie friends of a candidate will undertake, in case he is eturned, to pay the rent of the poorest voters who occupy nement houses, and the candidate subsequently makes up ie amount.[1] The expenses of congressional and presidential ections are often heavy, and though the larger part goes in rganization and demonstrations, meetings, torchlight pro-ssions, and so forth, a part is likely to go in some illicit way. member of Congress for a poor district in a great city told me at his expenses ran from $8000 up to $10,000, which is just out what a parliamentary contest used to cost in an English rough constituency of equal area. In America the number

ned. After the election of 1886 there was not a single petition. After that of 92 there were ten petitions alleging corrupt practices, and in three of these the ction was declared void on the ground of such practices. This improvement ist, however, be in some measure ascribed to the Redistribution Act of 1885, ich extinguished the small boroughs.

[1] At a recent election in Brooklyn, a number of coloured voters sat (literally) the fence in front of the polling booths, waiting to be bought, but were appointed, the parties having agreed not to buy them. There is a good deal bribery among the coloured voters in some of the cities: *e.g.* in those of ntucky and Southern Ohio.

When there is a real issue before the voters, bribery diminishes. In the yoralty contest of 1886, in New York, the usually venal classes went aight for the Labour candidate, and would not be bought.

of voters in a congressional district is more than five times a great as in an average English constituency. but the officia expenses of polling booths and clerks are not borne by th candidate. In a corrupt district along the Hudson Rive above New York I have heard of as much as $50,000 bein spent at a single congressional election, when in some othe districts of the State the expenses did not exceed $2000. I a presidential election great sums are spent in doubtful, or, a they are called, "pivotal" States. Indiana was "drenche with money" in 1880, much of it contributed by great corpora tions, and a large part doubtless went in bribery. What par ever does go it is the harder to determine, because election are rarely impeached on this ground, both parties tacitl agreeing that bygones shall be bygones. The election of 188 was one of the worst on record, so large was the expenditur in doubtful States. In that year well-informed Americans cam to perceive that bribery at elections was a growing evil i their country, though even now they think it less noxious tha either Bossism or election frauds. In 1883 the disease seeme to me no more diffused than it had been in England up to tha date. In 1890 the shadows had grown darker; and good cit zens were evidently becoming anxious.

This alarm has favoured the movement for the enactmen of laws against corrupt practices. A few States have no passed such statutes. Those of Missouri and California ar described as likely to prove efficient; those of Massachusett and Kansas, as less drastic, but fairly useful; those of Ne York, Michigan, and Colorado, as amounting to little more tha provisions for the compulsory publication of certain items c expenditure. In Pennsylvania it would appear that the act are seldom put in force. The practice, so general in America of conducting elections by a party committee, which makes it payments on behalf of all the candidates running in the sam interests, renders it more difficult than it is in Britain to fix definite limit to the expenditure, either by a candidate himse or upon the conduct of the election. However, the new Mi souri law attempts this, fixing a low scale for "campaig expenditures," and imposing severe penalties on the receiv as well as giver of any bribe, whether to vote or to refra from voting, a term in which bribery seems to be pretty fr

ient. Other but much lighter penalties are imposed on the ractice of treating. It seems probable that the example set y Missouri and California will be largely followed, and that ie blow struck at electoral corruption by the secret ballot ws will be followed up by a general limitation of expendi- ires. Whether the improvement will be permanent, and how eep it will go, is another question. It is always difficult to timate the exact value of laws which propose to effect by echanical methods reforms which in themselves are largely oral. This much, however, may be said, that while in all ountries there is a proportion (varying from age to age and ountry to country) of good men who will act honourably hatever the law, and similarly a proportion of bad men who ill try to break or evade the best laws, there is also a con- derable number of men standing between these two classes, hose tendency to evil is not too strong to be repressed by w, and in whom a moral sense is sufficiently present to be pable of stimulation and education by a good law. Although is true that you cannot make men moral by a statute, you n arm good citizens with weapons which improve their ances in the unceasing conflict with the various forms in hich political dishonesty appears. The value of weapons, owever, depends upon the energy of those who use them. ese improved Ballot acts and Corrupt Practices acts need to vigorously enforced, and the disposition, of which there have en some signs, to waive the penalties they impose, and to eat election frauds and other similar offences as trivial mat- rs, would go far to nullify the effect to be expected from e statutes.

Strong arguments have been adduced in favour of another form in election laws, viz., the trial of contested elections, not, now, by the legislative body to which the candidate claims have been chosen, but by a court of law. The determinations a legislature are almost invariably coloured by party feel- g, and are usually decided by a party majority in favour of e contestant whose admission would increase their strength. ence they obtain little respect, while corrupt or illegal prac- es do not receive their due condemnation in the avoidance the election they have tainted. Against these considera- ns there must be set the danger that the judges who try

such cases may sometimes show, or be thought to show, poli
ical partisanship, and that the credit of the bench may thu
suffer. The experience of England, where disputed parli
mentary elections have since 1867 been tried by judges of th
superior courts, and municipal elections since 1883 by count
court judges, does not wholly dispose of this apprehension
for it happens every now and then that judges are accused
partiality, or at least of an unconscious bias. Still, Britis
opinion decidedly prefers the present system to the old on
In the United States the validity of the election of an executiv
officer sometimes comes before the courts, and the courts,
a rule, decide such cases with a fairness which inspires gener
confidence. The balance of reason and authority seems to l
with those who, like ex-Speaker Reed, himself a hearty part
man, have advocated the change. It was proposed as a co
stitutional amendment by the legislature of New York
the voters in 1892, but rejected, under circumstances, hov
ever, which do not forbid the hope that it may eventual
prevail.

Not satisfied, however, with the purification of electio
methods, some reformers go further, and have proposed
render the ballot box a more complete representation of th
will of the people by making voting compulsory. The idea
not quite new; in some Greek States citizens were compell
to attend the Assembly; similar provisions were to be found
parts of the United States in the last century, while in mode
Switzerland several cantons fine electors who fail to vote
elections or when laws are proposed under a referendum. T
Swiss evidence as to the merits of the plan is not uniform.
St. Gallen, for instance, where it was introduced so far ba
as 1835, it seems to have worked well, while in Solothurn
proved ineffective, and was ultimately abolished. On t
whole, however, the effect would seem to have been to bri
out a comparatively heavy vote, sometimes reaching 83 and ev
84 per cent of the registered electors, though it deserves to
noticed that the cantons in which the plan exists are, speaki
generally, those in which political life is anyhow most activ
In the United States, however, abstention from voting do

[1] I quote from a paper by M. Simon Deploige in the Belgian *Revue Gener*
for March, 1893.

not appear to be a very serious, and certainly is not a growing, evil. City and State elections sometimes fail to draw even three-fourths of the voters to the polls; but in the presidential election of 1880, a year coinciding with that of the national census, and therefore suitable for investigation, 84 per cent of the qualified voters in the whole United States actually tendered their votes, while of the remaining 16 per cent fully three-fourths can be accounted for by illness, old age, necessary causes of absence, and, in the case of the Southern negroes, intimidation, leaving not more than 4 per cent out of the total number of voters who may seem to have stayed away from pure indifference.[1] This is a good result as compared with Germany, where, in 1887, only 77 per cent of the qualified voters came to the polls, or with the United Kingdom, where, at the parliamentary election of 1892, an election of unprecedented excitement, about 77 per cent of the electors seem to have voted in those constituencies where there was a contest, the figures being: for England, 78 per cent; for Scotland, 78; for Wales, 75, and for Ireland, 66. It is right to add that, owing to the defects of the British registration laws, there were probably more names on the register in proportion to the number actually in a position to come to the poll than would be the case in the United States or in Germany. In the presidential election of 1892 the total number of votes cast showed only about half the increase on 1888 which the estimated growth of population ought to have given. This abstention, however, may have been largely due not to indifference, but to an unwillingness in one party to support the party candidate.

The plan of compelling men to vote on pain of being fined or incurring some disability, though it has found some favour in America, is not likely to be adopted, and one of the arguments against it is indicated by the cause suggested for the abstentions of 1892. It is not desirable to deprive electors displeased by the nomination of a candidate of the power of protesting against him by declining to vote at all. At present, when bad nominations are made, independent voters can express their disapproval by refusing to vote for these candidates.

[1] The subject is examined with care and acuteness by Professor A. B. Hart in his *Practical Essays on American Government*.

Were voting compulsory, they would probably, so strong is part spirit, vote for these bad men rather than for their opponents not to add that the opponents might be equally objectionable Thus the power of party leaders and of the machine ger erally might be increased. I doubt, however, whether suc a law as suggested could, if enacted, be effectively enforced and it is not well to add another to the list of half-execute statutes.

The abuse of the right of appointing election officers ca hardly be called a corrupt practice; yet it has in some places and notably in New York City, caused serious mischief. There elections have been under the control of the Police Board consisting of four commissioners, two of whom are require by law to be Democrats, two to be Republicans.[1] By a statut of 1892, this Board is directed to appoint in each of the 118 election districts of the city, three inspectors of elections, tw of whom are to belong to the party which cast the greates number of votes in the last preceding election, and one to th party which cast the next greatest number. This audaciou piece of partisanship has given the dominant faction in the cit the command of a great number of paid places wherewith t reward its adherents. The cost of the three inspectors, two po clerks, and two ballot clerks in the 1187 districts is $178,800 and the selection of shops or other buildings as polling place with the nomination to some other election posts, adds sti further to the mass of patronage, and enables the party Machi to benefit no small part of its adherents at the cost of th city. Taken along with the practice of treating all, or near all, appointments in the service of the city as party spoil it provides a Machine with a large number of paid workers each Assembly district, who can be depended on to fight ha and constantly for the party, and especially to enrol recrui and bring them up to the poll. The statute, it is right add, has received much censure, and may probably be soo repealed.

[1] This statutory recognition of party as a qualification for office is r unusual in America, having been found necessary to ensure an approach equality of distribution between the parties of the posts of election office for the fairness of whose action it was essential that there should be some s of guarantee.

The particular form of evil here described still flourishes like a green bay tree. But on the whole, as will have been gathered from this chapter, the record of recent progress is encouraging, and not least encouraging in this, that the corrupt politicians themselves have been forced to accept and pass measures of reform which public opinion, previously apathetic or ignorant, had been aroused by a few energetic voices to demand.

CHAPTER LXVII

CORRUPTION

No impression regarding American politics is more generall diffused in Europe than that contained in the question whic the traveller who has returned from the United States becom so weary of being asked, "Isn't everybody corrupt there?" is an impression for which the Americans themselves, with the airy way of talking about their own country, their fondness f broad effects, their enjoyment of a good story and humorou pleasure in exaggerations generally, are largely responsibl European visitors who, generally belonging to the wealthi classes, are generally reactionary in politics, and glad to fi occasion for disparaging popular government, eagerly catch u and repeat the stories they are told in New York or Sa Francisco. European readers take literally the highly colour pictures of some American novels and assume that the descri tions there given of certain men and groups "inside politics — descriptions legitimate enough in a novel — hold true of a men and groups following that unsavoury trade. European moreover, and Englishmen certainly not less than other Eur peans, have a useful knack of forgetting their own shortcomin when contemplating those of their neighbours; so you may he men wax eloquent over the depravity of transatlantic politicia who will sail very near the wind in giving deceptive pledges their own constituents, who will support flagrant jobs done behalf of their own party, who will accept favours from, a dine with, and receive at their own houses, financial speculato and members of the legislature whose aims are just as base, a whose standard is just as low as those of the worst congressm that ever came to push his fortune in Washington.

I am sensible of the extreme difficulty of estimating t amount of corruption that prevails in the United States. If

native American does not know — as few do — how deep it goes nor how widely it is spread, much less can a stranger. I have, however, submitted the impressions I formed to the judgment of some fair-minded and experienced American friends, and am assured by them that these impressions are substantially correct; that is to say, that they give a view of the facts such as they have themselves formed from an observation incomparably wider than that of a European traveller could be.

The word "corruption" needs to be analyzed. It is used to cover several different kinds of political unsoundness.

One sense, the most obvious, is the taking or giving of money bribes. Another sense is the taking or giving of bribes in kind, *e.g.* the allotment of a certain quantity of stock or shares in a company, or of an interest in a profitable contract, or of a land grant. The offence is essentially the same as where a money bribe passes, but to most people it does not seem the same, partly because the taking of money is a more unmistakable selling of one's self, partly because it is usually uncertain how the bribe given in kind will turn out, and a man excuses himself by thinking that its value will depend on how he develops the interest he has obtained. A third sense of the word includes the doing of a job, *e.g.* promising a contractor that he shall have the clothing of the police or the cleaning of the city thoroughfares in return for his political support; giving official advertisements to a particular newspaper which puffs you; promising a railroad president, whose subscription to party funds is hoped for, to secure the defeat of a bill seeking to regulate the freight charges of his road or threatening its land grants. These cases shade off into those of the last preceding group, but they seem less black, because the act done is one which would probably be done anyhow by some one else from no better motive, and because the turpitude consists not in getting a private gain, but in misusing a public position to secure a man's own political advancement. Hence the virtue that will resist a bribe will often succumb to these temptations.

There is also the sense in which the bestowal of places of power and profit from personal motives is said to be a corrupt exercise of patronage. Opinion has in all countries been lenient to such action when the place is given as a reward of party

services, but the line between a party and a personal service cannot be easily drawn.

Then, lastly, one sometimes hears the term stretched to cover insincerity in professions of political faith. To give pledges and advocate measures which one inwardly dislikes and deems opposed to the public interest is a form of misconduct which seems far less gross than to sell one's vote or influence, but it may be, in a given instance, no less injurious to the State.

Although these two latter sets of cases do not fall within the proper meaning and common use of the word "corruption," it seems worth while to mention them, because derelictions of duty which a man thinks trivial in the form with which custom has made him familiar in his own country, where perhaps they are matter for merriment, shock him when they appear in a different form in another country. They get mixed up in his mind with venality, and are cited to prove that the country is corrupt and its politicians profligate. A European who does not blame a minister for making a man governor of a colony because he has done some back-stairs parliamentary work, will be shocked at seeing in New York some one put into the custom-house in order that he may organize primaries in the district of the congressman who has got him the place. English members of Parliament condemn the senator who moves a resolution intended to "placate" the Irish vote, while they forget their own professions of ardent interest in schemes which they think economically unsound but likely to rouse the flagging interest of the agricultural labourer. Distinguishing these senses in which the word "corruption" is used, let us attempt to inquire how far it is chargeable on the men who compose each of the branches of the American Federal and State government.

No President has ever been seriously charged with pecuniary corruption. The Presidents have been men very different in their moral standard, and sometimes neither scrupulous nor patriotic, but money or money's worth they have never touched for themselves, great as the temptations must have been to persons with small means and heavy expenses. They have doubtless often made bad appointments from party motives, have sought to strengthen themselves by the use of their patronage, have talked insincerely and tolerated jobs; but all

these things have also been done within the last thirty years by sundry English, French, and Italian prime ministers, some of whom have since been canonized.

The standard of honour maintained by the Presidents has not always been maintained by the leading members of recent administrations, several of whom have been suspected of complicity in railroad jobs, and even in frauds upon the revenue. They may not have, probably they did not, put any part of the plunder into their own pockets, but they have winked at the misdeeds of their subordinates, and allowed the party funds to be replenished, not by direct malversation, yet by rendering services to influential individuals or corporations which a strict sense of public duty would have forbidden. On the other hand, it is fair to say that there seems to be no case since the war — although there was a bad case in President Buchanan's Cabinet just before the war — in which a member of the Cabinet has received money, or its equivalent, as the price of either an executive act or an appointment, while inferior officials, who have been detected in so doing (and this occasionally happens), have been dismissed and disgraced.[1]

Next, as to Congress. It is particularly hard to discover the truth about Congress, for few of the abundant suspicions excited and accusations brought against senators or members of the House have been, or could have been, sifted to the bottom. Among four hundred and fifty men there will be the clean and the unclean. The opportunities for private gain are large, the chances of detection small; few members keep their seats for three or four successive congresses, and one-half are changed every two years, so the temptation to make hay while the sun shines is all the stronger.

There are several forms which temptation takes in the Federal legislature. One is afforded by the position a member holds on a committee. All bills and many resolutions are referred to some one of the committees, and it is in the committee-room that their fate is practically decided. In a small body each member has great power, and the exercise of power (as observed already)[2] is safeguarded by little responsibility.

[1] The so-called Whiskey Ring of 1875 and the Star Route gang of more recent times are perhaps the most conspicuous instances of misconduct in the civil service. [2] See Chapter XV. in Vol. I. on the Committees of Congress.

He may materially advance a bill promoted by an influentia manufacturer, or financier, or railroad president. He may obstruct it. He may help, or may oppose, a bill directed against a railroad or other wealthy corporation, which has something to gain or lose from Federal legislation.[1] No small part of the business of Congress is what would be called in England private business; and although the individual railroads which come directly into relation with the Federal government are not numerous, — the great transcontinental lines which have received land grants or other subventions are the most important, — questions affecting these roads have frequently come up and have involved large amounts of money. The tariff on imports opens another enormous sphere in which legislative intervention affects private pecuniary interests; for it makes all the difference to many sets of manufacturers whether duties on certain classes of goods are raised, or maintained, or lowered. Hence the doors of Congress are besieged by a whole army of commercial or railroad men and their agents, to whom, since they have come to form a sort of profession, the name of Lobbyists is given.[2] Many congressmen are personally interested and lobby for themselves among their colleagues from the vantage-ground of their official positions.

Thus a vast deal of solicitation and bargaining goes on. Lobbyists offer considerations for help in passing a bill which is desired or in stopping a bill which is feared. Two members, each of whom has a bill to get through, or one of whom desires to prevent his railroad from being interfered with while the other wishes the tariff on an article which he manufactures kept up, make a compact by which each aids the other. This is Log-rolling: You help me to roll my log, which is too heavy for my unaided strength, and I help you to roll yours. Sometimes a member brings in a bill directed against some railroad or other great corporation, merely in order to levy blackmail

[1] I remember to have heard of the governor of a Western Territory who, when he came East, used to borrow money from the head of a great railway which traversed his Territory, saying he would oblige the railway when he found occasion to ask him. His power of obliging included the right to veto bills passed by the Territorial legislature. This governor was an ex-boss of an Eastern State whom his party had provided for by bestowing the governorship on him.

[2] See *ante*, Note (B) to Chapter XVI. in Appendix to Vol. I.

upon it. This is technically called a Strike. An eminent railroad president told me that for some years a certain senator regularly practised this trick. When he had brought in his bill he came straight to New York, called at the railroad offices, and asked the president what he would give him to withdraw the bill. That the Capitol and the hotels at Washington are a nest of such intrigues and machinations, while Congress is sitting, is admitted on all hands; but how many of the members are tainted no one can tell. Sometimes when money passes, it goes not to the member of Congress himself, but to some Boss who can and does put pressure on him. Sometimes, again, a lobbyist will demand a sum for the purpose of bribing a member who is really honest, and, having ascertained that the member is going to vote in the way desired, will keep the sum in his own pocket. Bribery often takes the form of a transfer of stocks or shares, nor have even free passes on railroads been scorned by some of the more needy legislators. The abuse on this head had grown so serious that the bestowal of passes was forbidden [on inter-State lines] by Federal statute in 1887, and is now forbidden by the Constitutions of many States.[1] In 1883 portions of a correspondence in the years 1876–78 between Mr. Huntington, one of the proprietors and directors of the Central Pacific Railroad, who then represented that powerful corporation at Washington, and one of his agents in California, were published; and from these it appeared that the company, whose land grants were frequently threatened by hostile bills, and which was exposed to the competition of rival enterprises, which (because they were to run through Territories) Congress was asked to sanction, defended itself by constant dealings with senators and representatives — dealings in the course of which it offered money and bonds to those whose support it needed.[2]

[1] All lines traversing the territory of more than one State are subject to the power of Congress to "regulate commerce." As to free passes, see the instructive remarks of the Inter-State Commerce Commission in their First Report. The grant by the State of free passes on railways to members of the Chambers has led to abuses in Italy.

[2] Mr. Huntington comments freely on the character of various members of both Houses, and describes not only his own operations, but those of Mr. Scott, his able and active opponent, who had the great advantage of being able to command passes on some railways running out of Washington. In one letter he uses a graphic and characteristic metaphor: "Scott has switched off

It does not seem, from what one hears on the spot, that money is often given, or, I should rather say, it seems that the men to whom it is given are few in number. But considerations of some kind pretty often pass,[1] so that corruption in both the first and second of the above senses must be admitted to exist and to affect a portion, though only a small portion, of Congress.[2] A position of some delicacy is occupied by eminent lawyers who sit in Congress and receive retainers from powerful corporations whose interests may be affected by congressional legislation, retainers for which they are often not expected to render any forensic service.[3] There are various ways in which members of Congress can use their position to advance their personal interests. They have access to the executive, and can obtain favours from it; not so much because the executive cares what legislation they pass, for it has little to do with legislation, but that the members of the Cabinet are on their promotion, and anxious to stand well with persons whose influence covers any considerable local area, who may perhaps be even able to control the delegation of a State in a nominating convention. Hence a senator or congressman may now and then sway the executive towards a course it would not otherwise have taken, and the resulting gain to himself, or to some person who has invoked his influence, may be an illicit gain probably not in the form of money, but as a job out of which something may be made. Again, it has been hitherto an important part of a member's duty to obtain places for his constituents in the Federal civil service. There are about 130,000 o

(*i.e.* off the Central Pacific track and on to his own railroad track) Senator S. and W., but you know they can be switched back with the proper arrangements when they are wanted."

The Report of the U. S. Pacific Railway Commission says of these transactions, "There is no room for doubt that a large portion of the sum of $4,818,00 was used for the purpose of influencing legislation and of preventing the passage of measures deemed to be hostile to the interests of the company, and for the purpose of influencing elections." — Report, p. 84.

[1] The president of a great Western Railroad told me that Congressmen used to come to the company's office to buy its land, and on seeing the price-list would say, "But isn't there a discount? Surely you can give the land cheaper to a friend. You know I shall be your friend in Congress," and so forth.

[2] Among the investigations which disclosed the existence of bribery among members of Congress, the most prominent since that of 1856–57 are those of the Credit Mobilier and the Pacific Mail cases.

[3] See Vol. I., p. 121, note.

uch places. Here was a vast field, if not for pecuniary gain, or appointments are not sold, yet for the gratification of per-onal and party interests. Nor does the mischief stop with he making of inferior appointments, for the habit of ignoring ublic duty which is formed blunts men's sense of honour, and nakes them more apt to yield to some grosser form of tempta-ion. Similar causes produced similar effects during last cen-ury in England, and it is said that the French legislature now uffers from the like malady, members of the Chamber being ncessantly occupied in wheedling or threatening the executive nto conferring places and decorations upon their constituents. The rank and file of the Federal civil service attain a level f integrity as high as that of England or Germany. The tate civil service is comparatively small, and in most States ne hears little said against it; yet cases of defaulting State reasurers are not uncommon. Taking one part of the coun-ry with another, a citizen who has business with a govern-nent department, such as the customs or excise, or with a tate treasurer's office, or with a poor law or school authority, as as much expectation of finding honest men to deal with as e has of finding trustworthy agents to conduct a piece of rivate commercial business. Instances of dishonesty are nore noticed when they occur in a public department, but ney seem to be little (if at all) more frequent.

It is hard to form a general judgment regarding the State egislatures, because they differ so much among themselves. hose of Massachusetts, Vermont, and several of the North-estern States, such as Michigan, are pure, *i.e.* the members ho would take a bribe are but few, and those who would ush through a job for some other sort of consideration a com-aratively small fraction of the whole.[1] Even in the North-west, owever, a wealthy man has great advantages in securing a Fed-al senatorship at the hands of the legislature. Some States, ncluding New York and Pennsylvania, have so bad a name hat people are surprised when a good act passes, and a strong overnor is kept constantly at work vetoing bills corruptly btained. Several causes have contributed to degrade the

[1] The new Western (including the Territorial) legislatures vary greatly om time to time. Sometimes they are quite pure; the next election under ne demagogic impulse may bring in a crowd of mischievous adventurers.

legislature of New York State. The Assembly having bu
128 members, and the Senate 32, each member is worth buy
ing. There are in the State, besides New York and Brooklyn
several smaller Ring-governed cities whence bad member
come. There are also immensely powerful corporations, such
as the great railroads which traverse it on their way to th
West. Great corporations are everywhere the bane of Stat
politics, for their management is secret, being usually in th
hands of one or two capitalists, and their wealth is so larg
that they can offer bribes at which ordinary virtue grows pale
They have, moreover, in many cases this excuse, that it is only
by the use of money they can ward off the attacks constantly
made upon them by demagogues or blackmailers. The Assem
bly includes many honest men, and a few rich men who d
not need a *douceur*, but the proportion of tainted men is larg
enough to pollute the whole lump. Of what the bribe-take
gets he keeps a part for himself, using the rest to buy th
doubtful votes of purchasable people; to others he promise
his assistance when they need it, and when by such log-rollin
he has secured a considerable backing, he goes to the hones
men, among whom, of course, he has a considerable acquain
ance, puts the matter to them in a plausible way, — they ar
probably plain farmers from the rural districts, — and so gain
his majority. Each great corporation keeps an agent at Albany
the capital of the State, who has authority to buy off the pro
moters of hostile bills, and to employ the requisite profe
sional lobbyists. Such a lobbyist, who may or may not h
himself a member, bargains for a sum down, $5000 or $10,000
in case he succeeds in getting the bill in question passed o
defeated, as the case may be; and when the session ends h
comes for his money, and no questions are asked. This so
of thing now goes on, or has lately gone on, in several othe
States, though nowhere on so grand a scale. Virginia, Mary
land, California, Illinois, Missouri, are all more or less impur
Louisiana, under the influence of its lottery company (no
happily at an end), was even worse than New York. But th
lowest point was reached in some of the Southern State
shortly after the war, when, the negroes having received th
suffrage, the white inhabitants were still excluded as rebel
and the executive government was conducted by Northe

arpet-baggers under the protection of Federal troops. In ome States the treasury was pilfered; huge State debts were un up; negroes voted farms to themselves; all kinds of rob- ery and jobbery went on unchecked. South Carolina, for nstance, was a perfect Tartarus of corruption, as much below ne Hades of Illinois or Missouri as the heaven of ideal purity above the ordinary earth of Boston and Westminster.[1] In its gislature there was an old darkey, jet black and with vener- ble white hair, a Methodist preacher, and influential among is brother statesmen, who kept a stall for legislation, where e dealt in statutes at prices varying from $100 to $400. ince those days there has been a peaceful revolution for the etter at the South, but some of its legislative bodies have ill much leeway to make up.

Of city governments I have spoken in previous chapters. hey begin to be bad when the population approaches 100,000, nd includes a large proportion of recent immigrants. They re generally pure in smaller places, that is to say, nearly as ure as those of an average English, French, or German city.

The form which corruption usually takes in the populous ties is the grant at a wholly inadequate price of "franchises" especially monopolies in the use of public thoroughfares), — frequent and scandalous practice,[2] — the jobbing of contracts, nd the bestowal of places upon personal adherents, both of them sults not unknown in large European municipalities, and said to e specially rife in Paris, though no rifer than under Louis Napo- on, when the reconstruction of the city under Prefect Hauss- an provided unequalled opportunities for the enrichment individuals at the public expense. English vestries, local oards, and even, though much more rarely, town councils, do me quiet jobbery. No European city has, however, witnessed andals approaching those of New York or Philadelphia, where e public till has been robbed on a vast scale, and accounts ave been systematically cooked to conceal the thefts.

On a review of the whole matter, the following conclusions ay be found not very wide of the truth.

[1] Τόσσον ἔνερθ' Αἴδεω ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης.

[2] The most notorious recent case is the sale by the New York aldermen of e right to lay a tramway in Broadway. Nearly the whole number were dicted, and some were punished by imprisonment.

Bribery exists in Congress, but is confined to a few members, say five per cent of the whole number. It is more common in the legislatures of a few, but only a few States, practically absent from the higher walks of the Federal civil service, rare among the chief State officials, not frequent among the lower officials, unknown among the Federal judges, rare among State judges.[1]

The taking of other considerations than money, such as a share in a lucrative contract, or a railway pass, or a "good thing" to be secured for a friend, prevails among legislators to a somewhat larger extent. Being less coarsely palpable than the receipt of money, it is thought more venial. One may roughly conjecture that from fifteen to twenty per cent of the members of Congress or of an average State legislature would allow themselves to be influenced by inducements of this kind.

Malversation of public funds occurs occasionally in cities, less frequently among Federal or State officers.

Jobbery of various kinds, *i.e.* the misuse of a public position for the benefit of individuals, is not rare, and in large cities common. It is often disguised as a desire to render some service to the party, and the same excuse is sometimes found for a misappropriation of public money.

Patronage is usually dispensed with a view to party considerations or to win personal support. But this remark is equally true of England and France, the chief difference being that owing to the short terms and frequent removals the quantity of patronage is relatively greater in the United States.

If this is not a bright picture, neither is it so dark as that which most Europeans have drawn, and which the loose language of many Americans sanctions. What makes it seem dark is the contrast between the deficiencies which the government shows in this respect, and the excellence, on the one hand of the frame of the Constitution, on the other, of the tone and sentiment of the people. The European reader may, however, complain that the picture is vague in its outlines. I cannot make it more definite. The facts are not easy to ascertain, and

[1] Senators are often charged with buying themselves into the Senate; but so far as I could ascertain, it does not often happen that a candidate for the Senate directly bribes members of the State legislature, though frequently he makes heavy contributions to the party election fund, used to defray the election expenses of the members of the party dominant in the State legislature.

is hard to say what standard one is to apply to them. In the ase of America men are inclined to apply a rigid standard, ecause she is a republic, professing to have made a new eparture in politics, and setting before her a higher ideal than ost European monarchies. Yet it must be remembered that a new and large country, where the temptations are enormous nd the persons tempted have many of them no social position forfeit, the conditions are not the most favourable to virtue. f, recognizing the fact that the path of the politician is in all ountries thickly set with snares, we leave ideals out of sight nd try America by the average concrete standard of Europe, e shall find that while her legislatures fall much below the evel of purity maintained in England and Germany, and also elow that of France and Italy, the whole body of her Federal fficials, in spite of the evils flowing from an uncertain tenure, not, in point of integrity, at this moment markedly inferior the administrations of most European countries. The same ay be said of the State officials. It cannot, however, be said f those who administer the business of the larger cities, for he standard of purity has there sunk to a point lower than hat which the municipalities of any European country show.

CHAPTER LXVIII

THE WAR AGAINST BOSSDOM

It must not be supposed the inhabitants of Ring-ruled citie tamely submit to their tyrants. The Americans are indeed what with their good nature and what with the preoccupatio of the most active men in their private business, a long-sufferin people. But patience has its limits, and when a Ring ha pushed paternal government too far, an insurrection may brea out. Rings have generally the sense to scent the coming storm and to avert it by making two or three good nominations, an promising a reduction of taxes. Sometimes, however, the hold on their course fearless and shameless, and then the storm breaks upon them.

There are several forms which a reform movement or othe popular rising takes. The recent history of great cities supplie examples of each. The first form is an attack upon the pri maries. They are the key of a Ring's position, and when the have been captured their batteries can be turned against th Ring itself. When an assault upon the Bosses is resolve upon, the first thing is to form a committee. It issues a man festo calling on all good citizens to attend the primaries i their respective wards, and there vote for delegates opposed the Ring. The newspapers take the matter up, and repeat th exhortation. As each primary is held, on the night fixed b the ward committee of the regular (that is the Ring) organiz tion, some of the reformers appear at it, and propose a list delegates, between whom and the Ring's list a vote of th members of the primary is taken. This may succeed in som of the primaries, but rarely in a majority of them; becau (as explained in a previous chapter) the rolls seldom or nev include the whole party voters of the ward, having been pr pared by the professionals in their own interest. Sometim

nly one-fourth or one-fifth of the voters are on the primary oll, and these are of course the men on whom the Ring can ely. Hence, even if the good citizens of the district, obeying he call of patriotism and the Reform Committee, present themelves at the primary, they may find so few of their number on he roll that they will be outvoted by the ringsters. But the nost serious difficulty is the apathy of the respectable, steadyoing part of the population to turn out in sufficient numbers. Chey have their engagements of business or pleasure to attend o, or it is a snowy night and their wives persuade them to tay indoors. The well-conducted men of small means are an minently domestic class, who think they do quite enough for he city and the nation if they vote at the polls. It is still nore difficult to induce the rich to interest themselves in conessedly disagreeable work. They find themselves at a primary n strange and uncongenial surroundings. Accustomed to be reated with deference in their counting-house or manufactory, hey are jostled by a rough crowd, and find that their servants r workmen are probably better known and more influential nan they are themselves. They recognize by sight few of the ersons present, for, in a city, acquaintance does not go by roximity of residence, and are therefore at a disadvantage for ombined action, whereas the professional politicians are a egiment where every private in each company knows his ellow-private and obeys the officers. Hence, the best, perhaps ne only chance of capturing a primary is by the action of a roup of active young men who will take the trouble of organing the movement by beating up the members of the party ho reside in the district, and bearding the local bosses in the eeting. It is a rough and toilsome piece of work, but young en find a compensation in the fun which is to be had out of ne fight; and when a victory is won, theirs is the credit. To arry a few primaries is only the first step. The contest has be renewed in the convention, where the odds are still in vour of the professionals, who "know the ropes" and may ossibly outwit even a majority of Reform delegates. The anaging committee is in their hands, and they can generally cure a chairman in their interests. Experience has accordgly shown that this method of attacking the Machine very rely succeeds; and though the duty of attending the pri-

maries continues to be preached, the advice shares the fate of most sermons. Once in a way, the respectable voter will rouse himself, but he cannot be trusted to continue to do so year after year. He is like those citizen-soldiers of ancient Greece who would turn out for a summer inroad into the enemy's country, but refused to keep the field through the autumn and winter.

A second expedient, which may be tried instead of the first, or resorted to after the first has been tried and failed, is to make an independent list of nominations and run a separate set of candidates. If this strategy be resolved on, the primaries are left unheeded; but when the election approaches, a committee is formed which issues a list of candidates for some or all of the vacant offices in opposition to the "regular" list issued by the party convention, and conducts the agitation on their behalf. This saves all trouble in primaries or conventions, but involves much trouble in elections, because a complete campaign corps has to be organized, and a campaign fund raised.[1] Moreover, the average voter, not having followed politics closely enough to comprehend his true duty and interest, and yielding to his established party habits, inclines especially in State and Federal elections, to vote the "regular ticket." He starts with a certain prejudice against those who are "troubling Israel" by dividing the party, because he sees that in all probability the result will be not to carry the Independent ticket, but to let in the candidates of the opposite party. Hence the bolting Independents can rarely hope to carry with them enough of their own party to enable them to win the election. The result of their action will rather be to bring in the candidates of the other side, who may be no better than the men on the ticket of their own Ring. Accordingly, reformers have become reluctant to take this course, for

[1] "To run an anti-machine candidate for mayor it is necessary to organize a new machine at an expense of from $60,000 to $100,000 (£12,000 to £20,000) with a chance of his being 'sold out' then by the men who are hired to distribute his ballots." — Mr. J. R. Bishop in a paper on "Money in City Elections," written in 1887. Now that the new laws of most States provide for official voting papers, the last mentioned risk has disappeared, but the expense of getting up a new election organization is still heavy. Some one has said that the difference between running as a regular candidate and running on your own account as an independent candidate, is like the difference between travelling by railway and making a new railway of your own to travel by.

nough it has the merit of relieving their feelings, it exposes nem to odium, involves great labour, and effects nothing more nan may be obtained by one or other of the two methods hich I have next to describe.

The third plan is to abstain from voting for the names on our party ticket to whom you object. This is Scratching. ou are spared the trouble of running candidates of your own, ut your abstention, if the parties are nearly balanced, causes ne defeat of the bad candidates whom your own party puts forard, and brings in those of the other party. This is a good lan when you want to frighten a Ring, and yet cannot get the ore timid reformers to go the length of voting either an indeendent ticket or the ticket of the other party. It is employed hen a Ring ticket is not bad all through, but contains some ir names mingled with some names of corrupt or dangerous en. You scratch the latter and thereby cause their defeat; ne others, receiving the full strength of the party, are arried.

If, however, indignation against a dominant Ring has risen high as to overcome the party predilections of ordinary citins, if it is desired to administer condign and certain punishent to those who have abused the patience of the people, the formers will take a more decided course. They urge their iends to vote the ticket of the opposite party, either entire at least all the better names on it, thus ensuring its victory. his is an efficient method, but a desperate one, for you put to power a Ring of the party which you have been opposing l your life, and whose members are possibly quite as corrupt those of the Ring which controls your own party. The in you look for is not therefore the immediate gain of securg better city government, but the ultimate gain of raising e general practice of politics by the punishment of evilers. Hence, whenever there is time to do so, the best policy for the reformers to make overtures to the opposite party, d induce them by the promise of support to nominate better ndidates than they would have nominated if left to themlves. A group of Bolters afraid of being called traitors to eir party, will shrink from this course; and if they are eak in numbers, their approaches may be repulsed by the position. But the scheme is always worth trying, and has

several times been crowned with success. By it the reforming party among the Democrats of Baltimore recently managed to defeat their Ring in an election of judges. They settled in conference with the Republicans a non-partisan ticket, which gave the Republicans (who were a minority) a better share of the bench than they could have got by fighting alone, and which substituted respectable Democrats for the objectionable names on the regular Democratic ticket. A similar combination of the reform Republicans in Philadelphia with the Democrats, who in that city are in a permanent minority, led to the defeat of the Republican Gas Ring (whereof more in a later chapter). This method has the advantage of saving expense, because the bolters can use the existing machinery of the opposite party, which organizes the meetings and circulates the literature. It is on the whole the most promising strategy but needs tact as well as vigour on the part of the Independent leaders. Nor will the opposite party always accept the proffered help. Sometimes it fears the gifts of the Greeks. Sometimes it hopes to win unhelped, and therefore will not sacrifice any of its candidates to the scruples of the reformers. Sometimes its chiefs dislike the idea of reform so heartily as to prefer defeat at the hands of a Ring of the other party to a victory which might weaken the hold of professionals upon the Machine and lead to a general purification of politics.

If the opposite party refuses the overtures of the reformers who are "kicking" against their own Machine, or will not purify the ticket sufficiently to satisfy them, there remains the chance of forming a third party out of the best men of both the regular organizations, and starting a third set of candidates. This is an extension and improvement of the second of the four enumerated methods, and has the greater promise of success because it draws votes from both parties instead of from one only. It has been frequently employed of late years in cities, generally of the second order, by running what is called a "Citizens' Ticket."

Of course bolters who desert their own party at a city election do not intend permanently to separate themselves from it. Probably they will vote its ticket at the next State or presidential election. Their object is to shake the power of the local boss, and if they cannot overthrow the Ring, at least

frighten it into better behaviour. This they often effect. After the defeat of some notorious candidates, the jobs are apt to be less flagrant. But such repentances are like those of the sick wolf in the fable, and experience proves that when the public vigilance has been relaxed, the ringsters of both parties return to their wallowing in the mire.

The difficulties of getting good citizens to maintain a steady war against the professionals have been found so great, and in particular the attempt to break their control of the primaries has so often failed, that remedies have been sought in legislation. Not a few States have extended the penalties attached to bribery and frauds at public elections to similar offences committed at primaries and nominating conventions, deeming these acts to be, as in fact they are, scarcely less hurtful to the community when practised at purely voluntary and private gatherings than when employed at elections, seeing that the average electors follow the regular nomination like so many sheep: it is the candidate's party label, not his own character, that is voted for. Statutes have also been passed in some States for regulating the proceedings at primaries. For instance, Ohio provides that a certain notice shall be published of the holding of a primary; that judges, clerks, and supervisors of the election of delegates shall be sworn; that any qualified elector may challenge any one claiming to vote; that the asking, or giving, or taking a bribe, or an attempt to intimidate, shall be punishable offences, and disqualify the offending party from voting. Similar provisions protect the delegate to a convention from the candidate, the candidate from the delegate, and the party from both. Minnesota lately enacted a set of even more stringent regulations, making the annulment or destruction of any ballots cast at a party meeting held for the purpose of choosing either candidates or delegates, or the wrongfully preventing persons from voting who are entitled to vote, or personation, or "any other fraud or wrong tending to defeat or affect the result of the election," a misdemeanour punishable by a fine not exceeding $3000, or three years' imprisonment, or both penalties combined.[1] As astonishing as it seems to a European that legislation should not

[1] Statutes of Minnesota of 1887, Chapter IV. §§ 99–105. It is significant that these sections apply only to cities of 5000 inhabitants or upwards.

only recognize parties, but should actually attempt to regulate the internal proceedings of a political party at a perfectly voluntary gathering of its own members, a gathering whose resolutions no one is bound to obey or regard in any way, some of the wisest American publicists conceive that this plan offers the best chance of reforming the Machine and securing the freedom of the voter. Not much success has been hitherto attained; but the statutes have, in some cases (*e.g.* California), been expressed to apply only where the political party seeks to apply them, and the experiment has not been tried long enough to enable a judgment on it to be formed. That it should be tried at all is a phenomenon to be seriously pondered by those who are accustomed to point to America as the country where the principle of leaving things alone has worked most widely and usefully; and it is the strongest evidence of the immense vigour of these party organizations, and of the authority their nominations exert, that reformers, foiled in the effort to purify them by voluntary action, should be driven to invoke the arm of the law.

The struggle between the professional politicians and the reformers has been going on in the great cities, with varying fortune, for the last twenty years. As illustrations of the incidents that mark it will be found in subsequent chapters, I will here say only that in the onslaughts on the Rings, which most elections bring round, the reformers, though they seldom capture the citadel, often destroy some of the outworks, and frighten the garrison into a more cautious and moderate use of their power. After an election in which an "Independent ticket" has received considerable support, the bosses are disposed to make better nominations, and, as an eminent New York professional (the late Mr. Fernando Wood) said, "to pander a little to the moral sense of the community." Every campaign teaches the reformers where the enemy's weak points lie, and gives them more of that technical skill which has hitherto been the strength of the professionals. It is a warfare of volunteers against disciplined troops, but the volunteers, since they are fighting for the taxpayers at large, would secure so great a preponderance of numbers, if they could but move the whole body of respectable citizens, that their triumph will evidently depend in the long run upon their own constancy and earnest-

ess. If their zeal does not flag; if they do not suffer themelves to be disheartened by frequent repulses; if, not relying o absolutely on any one remedy, they attack the enemy at very point, using every social and educational as well as legal pliance, the example of their disinherited public spirit, as ell as the cogency of their arguments, cannot fail to tell on e voters; and no Boss, however adroit, no Ring, however rongly entrenched, will be able to withstand them. The war, owever, will not be over when the enemy has been routed. lthough much may be done by legislative remedies, such as ew election laws, new provisions against corruption, a reconruction of the frame of city government, and a purification of e civil service, there are certain internal and, so to speak, atural causes of mischief, the removal of which will need atience and unremitting diligence. In great cities — for it throughout chiefly of cities that we have to think — a large ction of the voters will, for many years to come, be comparively ignorant of the methods of free government which they e set to work. They will be ignorant even of their own inrests, failing to perceive that wasteful expenditure injures ose who do not pay direct taxes, as well as those who do. etaining some of the feelings which their European experience as tended to produce, they will distrust appeals coming from e more cultivated classes, and be inclined to listen to loosengued demagogues. Once they have joined a party they will ote at the bidding of its local leaders, however personally unorthy.[1] While this section remains numerous, Rings and

[1] Says Mr. Roosevelt: "Voters of the labouring class in the cities are very otional: they value in a public man what we are accustomed to consider rtues only to be taken into account when estimating private character. us if a man is open-handed and warm-hearted, they consider it as being a r offset to his being a little bit shaky when it comes to applying the eighth mmandment to affairs of State. In the lower wards (of New York City), ere there is a large vicious population, the condition of politics is often rly appalling, and the [local] boss is generally a man of grossly immoral blic and private character. In these wards many of the social organizations th which the leaders are obliged to keep on good terms are composed of minals or of the relatives and associates of criminals. . . . The president a powerful semi-political association was by profession a burglar, the man o received the goods he stole was an alderman. Another alderman was cted while his hair was still short from a term in the State prison. A school stee had been convicted of embezzlement and was the associate of crimis." — *Century Magazine* for Nov. 1886.

Bosses will always have materials ready to their hands. There is, however, reason to expect that with the progress of time this section will become relatively smaller. And even now, large as it is, it could be overthrown and bossdom extirpated, were the better citizens to maintain unbroken through a series of elections that unity and vigour of action of which they have at rare moments, and under the impulse of urgent duty, shown themselves capable. In America, as everywhere else in the world, the commonwealth suffers more often from apathy or short-sightedness in the upper classes, who ought to lead, than from ignorance or recklessness in the humbler classes, who are generally ready to follow when they are wisely and patriotically led.

CHAPTER LXIX

NOMINATING CONVENTIONS

In every American election there are two acts of choice, two periods of contest. The first is the selection of the candidate from within the party by the party; the other is the struggle between the parties for the place. Frequently the former of these is more important, more keenly fought over, than the latter, for there are many districts in which the predominance of one party is so marked that its candidate is sure of success, and therefore the choice of a candidate is virtually the choice of the officer or representative.

Preceding chapters have described the machinery which exists for choosing and nominating a candidate. The process is similar in every State of the Union, and through all elections to office, from the lowest to the highest, from that of common councilman for a city ward up to that of President of the United States. But, of course, the higher the office, and the larger the area over which the election extends, the greater are the efforts made to secure the nomination, and the hotter the passions it excites. The choice of a candidate for the presidency is so striking and peculiar a feature of the American system that it deserves a full examination.

Like most political institutions, the system of nominating the President by a popular convention is the result of a long process of evolution.

In the first two elections, those of 1789[1] and 1792, there was no need for nominations of candidates, because the whole nation wished and expected George Washington to be elected. So too,

[1] The President is now always chosen on the Tuesday after the first Monday in the November of an even year, whose number is a multiple of four (*e.g.* 1880, 1884, 1888), and comes into office in the spring following; but the first election was held in the beginning of 1789, because the Constitution had been then only just adopted.

when in 1796 Washington declared his retirement, the dominan feeling of one party was for John Adams, that of the other fo Thomas Jefferson, and nobody thought of setting out formall what was so generally understood.

In 1800, however, the year of the fourth election, there wa somewhat less unanimity. The prevailing sentiment of th Federalists went for re-electing Adams, and the small conclav of Federalist members of Congress which met to promote hi interest was deemed scarcely necessary. The (Democratic Republicans, however, while united in desiring to make Jeffe son President, hesitated as to their candidate for the vice-pres dency, and a meeting of Republican members of Congress wa therefore called to recommend Aaron Burr for this office. I was a small meeting and a secret meeting, but it is memorabl not only as the first congressional caucus, but as the first a tempt to arrange in any way a party nomination.

In 1804 a more regular gathering for the same purpose wa held. All the Republican members of Congress were summone to meet; and they unanimously nominated Jefferson for Pres dent, and George Clinton of New York for Vice-President. S in 1808 nearly all the Republican majority in both Houses c Congress met and formally nominated Madison and Clinto The same course was followed in 1812, and again in 181 But the objections which were from the first made to th action of the party in Congress, as being an arrogant usurpa tion of the rights of the people, — for no one dreamed of leavin freedom to the presidential electors. — gained rather than lo strength on each successive occasion, so much so that in 182 the few who met made no nomination,[1] and in 1824, out of th Democratic members of both Houses of Congress summoned t the "nominating caucus," as it was called, only sixty-six a tended, many of the remainder having announced their disa proval of the practice.[2] The nominee of this caucus came i only third at the polls, and this failure gave the *coup de grâ* to a plan which the levelling tendencies of the time, and th disposition to refer everything to the arbitrament of th

[1] It was not absolutely necessary to have a nomination, because there w a general feeling in favour of re-electing Monroe.

[2] The whole number was then 261, nearly all Democratic Republicans, t the Federalist party had been for some time virtually extinct.

sses, would in any case have soon extinguished. No con-essional caucus was ever again held for the choice of candi-es.

A new method, however, was not at once discovered. In 1828 ckson was recommended as candidate by the legislature of nnessee and by a number of popular gatherings in different ces, while his opponents accepted, without any formal nomi-ion, the then President, J. Q. Adams, as their candidate. In 31, however, assemblies were held by two great parties (the ti-Masons and the National Republicans, afterwards called nigs) consisting of delegates from most of the States; and h of these conventions nominated its candidates for the sidency and vice-presidency. A third "national conven-n" of young men, which met in 1832, adopted the Whig ninations, and added to them a series of ten resolutions, con-uting the first political platform ever put forth by a nominat-body. The friends of Jackson followed suit by holding ir national convention which nominated him and Van Buren. the election of 1836, a similar convention was held by the ksonian Democrats, none by their opponents. But for that 1840, national conventions of delegates from nearly all the tes were held by both Democrats and Whigs, as well as by (then young and very small) party of the Abolitionists. is precedent has been followed in every subsequent contest, hat the national nominating conventions of the great parties now as much a part of the regular machinery of politics as the rules which the Constitution itself prescribes for the tion. The establishment of the system coincides with and resents the complete social democratization of politics in kson's time. It suits both the professionals, for whom it ls occupation, and whose power it secures, and the ordinary zen who, not having leisure to attend to politics, likes to nk that his right of selecting candidates is recognized by mitting the selection to delegates whom he is entitled to e for. But the system was soon seen to be liable to fall er the control of selfish intriguers and therefore prejudicial the chances of able and independent men. As early as 4 Calhoun refused to allow his name to be submitted to a inating convention, observing that he would never have ed in breaking down the old congressional caucus had

he foreseen that its successor would prove so much mo pernicious.

Thus from 1789 till 1800 there were no formal nominations from 1800 till 1824, nominations were made by congression caucuses; from 1824 till 1840, nominations irregularly made b State legislatures and popular meetings were gradually ripenin towards the method of a special gathering of delegates fro the whole country. This last plan has held its ground fro 1840 till the present day, and is so exactly conformable to th political habits of the people that it is not likely soon disappear.

Its perfection, however, was not reached at once. The earl conventions were to a large extent mass meetings.[1] The lat and present ones are regularly-constituted representative bodie composed exclusively of delegates, each of whom has been du elected at a party meeting in his own State, and brings wi him his credentials. It would be tedious to trace in furth detail the process whereby the present system was created, I shall be content with sketching its outline as it now stands

The Constitution provides that each State shall choose many presidential electors as it has persons representing it Congress, *i.e.* two electors to correspond to the two senato from each State, and as many more as the State sends membe to the House of Representatives. Thus Delaware and Idal have each three electoral votes, because they have each on one representative besides their two senators. New York h thirty-six electoral votes: two corresponding to its two senato thirty-four corresponding to its thirty-four representatives the House.

Now in the nominating convention each State is allow twice as many delegates as it has electoral votes, *e.g.* Delawa and Idaho have each six delegates, New York has seventy-tw The delegates are chosen by local conventions in their seve States, viz. two for each congressional district by the par convention of that district, and four for the whole State (call delegates-at-large) by the State convention. As each conve

[1] In 1856 the first Republican convention, which nominated Fremont, w rather a mass meeting than a representative body, for in many States th was not a regular organization of the new party. So was the seceding Rep lican convention which met at Cincinnati in 1872 and nominated Greeley.

on is composed of delegates from primaries, it is the compo-
tion of the primaries which determines that of the local
onventions, and the composition of the local conventions
hich determines that of the national. To every delegate
ere is added a person called his "alternate," chosen by the
cal convention at the same time, and empowered to replace
m in case he cannot be present in the national convention.
the delegate is present to vote, the alternate is silent; if
om any cause the delegate is absent, the alternate steps into
s shoes.

Respecting the freedom of the delegate to vote for whom he
ill, there have been differences both of doctrine and of prac-
ce. A local convention or State convention may instruct its
legates which aspirant[1] shall be their first choice, or even in
se he cannot be carried, for whom their subsequent votes
all be cast. Such instructions are frequently given, and still
ore frequently implied, because a delegate is often chosen
pressly as being the supporter of one or other of the aspirants
hose names are most prominent. But the delegate is not
solutely bound to follow his instructions. He may vote even
the first ballot for some other aspirant than the one desired
his own local or State convention. Much more, of course,
ay he, though not so instructed, change his vote when it is
ain that that aspirant will not succeed. His vote is always
valid one, even when given in the teeth of his instructions;
t how far he will be held censurable for breaking them de-
nds on a variety of circumstances. His motives may be cor-
pt; perhaps something has been given him. They may be
rdonable; a party chief may have put pressure on him, or he
ay desire to be on the safe side, and go with the majority.
ey may be laudable; he really seeks to do the best for the
rty, or has been convinced by facts lately brought to his
owledge that the man for whom he is instructed is unworthy.
here motives are doubtful, it may be charitable, but it is not
fe, to assume that they are of the higher order. Each "State
legation" has its chairman, and is expected to keep together
ring the convention. It usually travels together to the place

[1] I use throughout the term "aspirant" to denote a competitor for the
nination, reserving the term "candidate" for the person nominated as the
ty's choice for the presidency.

of meeting; takes rooms in the same hotel; has a recognize headquarters there; sits in a particular place allotted to it i the convention hall; holds meetings of its members during th progress of the convention to decide on the course which i shall from time to time take. These meetings, if the State b a large and doubtful one, excite great interest, and the sharp eared reporter prowls round them, eager to learn how the vote will go. Each State delegation votes by its chairman, who an nounces how his delegates vote; but if his report is challenged the roll of delegates is called, and they vote individually Whether the votes of a State delegation shall be given solid fo the aspirant whom the majority of the delegation favours, o by the delegates individually according to their preferences, is point which has excited bitter controversy. The present prac tice of the Republican party (so settled in 1876 and again i 1880) allows the delegates to vote individually, even when the have been instructed by a State convention to cast a solid vote The Democratic party, on the other hand, sustains any suc instruction given to the delegation, and records the vote of a the State delegates for the aspirant whom the majority amon them approve.[1] This is the so-called Unit Rule. If, howeve the State convention has not imposed the unit rule, the delegate vote individually.

For the sake of keeping up party life in the Territories an in the Federal District of Columbia, delegates from them (an now [1893] even from the Indian Territory and Alaska) ar admitted to the national convention, although the Territorie and District have no votes in a presidential election. Deleg tions of States which are known to be in the hands of th opposite party, and whose preference of one aspirant to anothe will not really tell upon the result of the presidential electio are admitted to vote equally with the delegations of the State sure to go for the party which holds the convention. Th arrangement is justified on the ground that it sustains th interest and energy of the party in States where it is in minority. But it permits the choice to be determined by di tricts whose action will in no wise affect the election itself, an the delegates from these districts are apt to belong to a low

[1] An attempt was made at the Democratic convention in Chicago in Jul 1884, to overset this rule, but the majority reaffirmed it.

ass of politicians, and to be swayed by more sordid motives an those who come from States where the party holds a ajority.[1]

So much for the composition of the national convention: we ay now go on to describe its proceedings.

It is held in the summer immediately preceding a presiden- l election, usually in June or July, the election falling in ovember. A large city is always chosen, in order to obtain equate hotel accommodation, and easy railroad access. For- rly, conventions were commonly held in Baltimore or Phila- lphia, but since the centre of population has shifted to the ssissippi valley, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and espe- lly Chicago, have become the favourite spots.

Business begins by the "calling of the convention to order" the chairman of the National Party committee. Then a mporary chairman is nominated, and, if opposed, voted on; e vote sometimes giving an indication of the respective ength of the factions present. Then the secretaries and e clerks are appointed, and the rules which are to govern e business are adopted. After this, the committees, including ose on credentials and resolutions, are nominated, and the nvention adjourns till their report can be presented.

The next sitting usually opens, after the customary prayer, h the appointment of the permanent chairman, who inaugu- es the proceedings with a speech. Then the report of the mmittee on resolutions (if completed) is presented. It con- ns what is called the platform, a long series of resolutions bodying the principles and programme of the party, which usually been so drawn as to conciliate every section, and id or treat with prudent ambiguity those questions on which nion within the party is divided. Any delegate who objects a resolution can move to strike it out or amend it; but it is erally "sustained" in the shape it has received from the ctised hands of the committee.

Next follows the nomination of aspirants for the post of

[1] Although the large majority of the delegates in the conventions of the great parties belong to the class of professional politicians, there is always inority of respectable men who do not belong to that class, but have ined the post owing to their interest in seeing a strong and honest candi- chosen. The great importance of the business draws persons of talent experience from most parts of the country.

party candidate. The roll of States is called, and when a Stat is reached to which an aspirant intended to be nominate belongs, a prominent delegate from that State mounts the pla form, and proposes him in a speech extolling his merits, an sometimes indirectly disparaging the other aspirants. Anothe delegate seconds the nomination, sometimes a third follows and then the roll-call goes on till all the States have bee despatched, and all the aspirants nominated.[1] The average nu ber of nominations is seven or eight; it rarely exceeds twelve

Thus the final stage is reached, for which all else has bee but preparation — that of balloting between the aspirant The clerks call the roll of States from Alabama to Wisconsi and as each is called the chairman of its delegation announce the votes, *e.g.* six for A, five for B, three for C, unless, of cours under the unit rule, the whole vote is cast for that one aspira whom the majority of the delegation supports. When all hav voted, the totals are made up and announced. If one compe itor has an absolute majority of the whole number votin according to the Republican rule, a majority of two-thirds the number voting, according to the Democratic rule, he h been duly chosen, and nothing remains but formally to mal his nomination unanimous. If, however, as has usually ha pened of late years, no one obtains the requisite majority, t roll is called again, in order that individual delegates and de gations (if the unit rule prevails) may have the opportuni of changing their votes; and the process is repeated until so one of the aspirants put forward has received the requir number of votes. Sometimes many roll-calls take place. 1852 the Democrats nominated Franklin Pierce on the fort ninth ballot, and the Whigs General Scott on the fifty-thi In 1880, thirty-six ballots were taken before General Garfie was nominated. But, in 1835, Martin Van Buren; in 184 Henry Clay; in 1868 and 1872, Ulysses S. Grant; in 188 Mr. Cleveland, were unanimously nominated, the three form by acclamation, the latter on the first ballot. In 1884 M Blaine was nominated by the Republicans on the fourth ball

[1] Nominations may, however, be made at any subsequent time.

[2] However, in the Republican convention of 1888, fourteen aspirants w nominated at the outset, six of whom were voted for on the last ballot. Vo were given at one or other of the ballotings for nineteen aspirants in all.

r. Cleveland by the Democrats on the second; in 1888, Mr. arrison on the eighth. In 1892 both Mr. Harrison (then resident) and Mr. Cleveland were nominated on the first llot, each of them by an overwhelming majority. Thus it metimes happens that the voting is over in an hour or two, hile at other times it may last for days.

When a candidate for the presidency has been thus found, e convention proceeds to similarly determine its candidate r the vice-presidency. The inferiority of the office, and the haustion which has by this time overcome the delegates, ake the second struggle a less exciting and protracted one. requently one of the defeated aspirants is consoled by this inor nomination, especially if he has retired at the nick of me in favour of the rival who has been chosen. The work the convention is then complete, and votes of thanks to the airman and other officials conclude the proceedings. The o nominees are now the party candidates, entitled to the sup- rt of the party organizations and of loyal party men over e length and breadth of the Union.

Entitled to that support, but not necessarily sure to receive Even in America, party discipline cannot compel an indi- dual voter to cast his ballot for the party nominee. All that e convention can do is to recommend the candidate to the rty; all that opinion can do is to brand as a Kicker or Bolter hoever breaks away; all that the local party organization can is to strike the bolter off its lists. But how stands it, the ader will ask, with the delegates who have been present in e convention, have had their chance of carrying their man, d have been beaten? are they not held absolutely bound to pport the candidate chosen?

This is a question which has excited much controversy. The nstant impulse and effort of the successful majority have been impose such an obligation on the defeated minority, and the ief motive which has prevented it from being invariably for- ally enforced by a rule or resolution of the convention has been e fear that it might precipitate hostilities, might induce men independent character, or strongly opposed to some particular pirant, to refuse to attend as delegates, or to secede early in e proceedings when they saw that a person whom they dis- proved was likely to win.

At the Republican national convention at Chicago in June 1880, an attempt was successfully made to impose the obligation by the following resolution, commonly called the "Iron clad Pledge": —

"That every member of this convention is bound in honou to support its nominee, whoever that nominee may be, and tha no man should hold his seat here who is not ready so t agree."

This was carried by 716 votes to 3. But at the Republican national convention at Chicago in June, 1884, when a simila resolution was presented, the opposition developed was strong enough to compel its withdrawal; and in point of fact, severa conspicuous delegates at that convention strenuously opposed its nominee at the subsequent presidential election, themselve voting, and inducing others to vote, for the candidate of th Democratic party.

CHAPTER LXX

THE NOMINATING CONVENTION AT WORK

We have examined the composition of a national convention and the normal order of business in it. The more difficult task remains of describing the actual character and features of such an assembly, the motives which sway it, the temper it displays, the passions it elicits, the wiles by which its members are lured or driven to their goal.

A national convention has two objects, the formal declaration of the principles, views, and practical proposals of the party, and the choice of its candidates for the executive headship of the nation.

Of these objects the former has in critical times, such as the two elections preceding the Civil War, been of great importance. In the Democratic convention at Charleston in 1860, a debate on resolutions led to a secession, and to the break-up of the Democratic party.[1] But of late years the adoption of platforms, drafted in a vague and pompous style by the committee, has been almost a matter of form. Some observations on these enunciations of doctrine will be found in another chapter.[2]

The second object is of absorbing interest and importance, because the presidency is the great prize of politics, the goal of every statesman's ambition. The President can by his veto stop legislation adverse to the wishes of the party he represents. The President is the supreme dispenser of patronage.

[1] The national conventions of those days were much smaller than now, nor were the assisting spectators so numerous.

[2] Chap. LXXXIII. The nearest English parallel to an American "platform" is to be found in the addresses to their respective constituencies issued at a general election by the Prime Minister, if a member of the House of Commons, and the leader of the Opposition in that House. Such addresses, however, do not formally bind the whole party, as an American platform does.

One may therefore say that the task of a convention is to choose the party candidate. And it is a task difficult enough to tax all the resources of the host of delegates and their leaders. Who is the man fittest to be adopted as candidate? Not even a novice in politics will suppose that it is the best man, *i.e.* the wisest, strongest, and most upright. Plainly, it is the man most likely to win, the man who, to use the technical term, is most "available." What a party wants is not a good President but a good candidate. The party managers have therefore to look out for the person likely to gain most support, and at the same time excite least opposition. Their search is rendered more troublesome by the fact that many of them, being themselves either aspirants or the close allies of aspirants, are not disinterested, and are distrusted by their fellow-searchers.

Many things have to be considered. The ability of a statesman, the length of time he has been before the people, his oratorical gifts, his "magnetism," his family connections, his face and figure, the purity of his private life, his "record" (the chronicle of his conduct) as regards integrity — all these are matters needing to be weighed. Account must be taken of the personal jealousies and hatreds which a man has excited. To have incurred the enmity of a leading statesman, of a powerful boss or ring, even of an influential newspaper, is serious. Several such feuds may be fatal.

Finally, much depends on the State whence a possible candidate comes. Local feeling leads a State to support one of its own citizens; it increases the vote of his own party in that State, and reduces the vote of the opposite party. Where the State is decidedly of one political colour, *e.g.* so steadily Republican as Vermont, so steadily Democratic as Maryland, this consideration is weak, for the choice of a Democratic candidate from the former, or of a Republican candidate from the latter, would not make the difference of the State's vote. It is therefore from a doubtful State that a candidate may with most advantage be selected; and the larger the doubtful State, the better. California, with her five electoral votes, is just worth "placating"; Indiana, with her fifteen votes, more so; New York, with her thirty-six votes, most so of all. Hence an aspirant who belongs to a great and doubtful State is *prima facie* the most eligible candidate.

Aspirants hoping to obtain the party nomination from a national convention may be divided into three classes, the two last of which, as will appear presently, are not mutually exclusive, viz. —

Favourites. Dark Horses. Favourite Sons.

A Favourite is always a politician well known over the Union, and drawing support from all or most of its sections. He is a man who has distinguished himself in Congress, or in the war, or in the politics of some State so large that its politics are matter of knowledge and interest to the whole nation. He is usually a person of conspicuous gifts, whether as a speaker, or a party manager, or an administrator. The drawback to him is that in making friends he has also made enemies.

A Dark Horse is a person not very widely known in the country at large, but known rather for good than for evil. He has probably sat in Congress, been useful on committees, and gained some credit among those who dealt with him in Washington. Or he has approved himself a safe and assiduous party man in the political campaigns of his own and neighbouring States, yet without reaching national prominence. Sometimes he is a really able man, but without the special talents that win popularity. Still, speaking generally, the note of the Dark Horse is respectability, verging on colourlessness; and he is therefore a good sort of person to fall back upon when able but dangerous Favourites have proved impossible. That native mediocrity rather than adverse fortune has prevented him from winning fame is proved by the fact that the Dark Horses who have reached the White House, if they have seldom turned out bad Presidents, have even more seldom turned out distinguished ones.

A Favourite Son is a politician respected or admired in his own State, but little regarded beyond it. He may not be, like the Dark Horse, little known to the nation at large, but he has not fixed its eye or filled its ear. He is usually a man who has sat in the State legislature; filled with credit the post of State governor; perhaps gone as senator or representative to Washington, and there approved himself an active promoter of local interests. Probably he possesses the qualities which gain local popularity, — geniality, activity, sympathy with the dominant

sentiment and habits of his State; or while endowed with gifts excellent in their way, he has lacked the audacity and tenacity which push a man to the front through a jostling crowd. More rarely he is a demagogue who has raised himself by flattering the masses of his State on some local questions, or a skilful handler of party organizations who has made local bosses and spoilsmen believe that their interests are safe in his hands. Anyhow, his personality is such as to be more effective with neighbours than with the nation, as a lamp whose glow fills the side chapel of a cathedral sinks to a spark of light when carried into the nave.

A Favourite Son may be also a Dark Horse; that is to say, he may be well known in his own State, but so little known out of it as to be an unlikely candidate. But he need not be. The types are different, for as there are Favourite Sons whom the nation knows but does not care for, so there are Dark Horses whose reputation, such as it is, has not been made in State affairs, and who rely very little on State favour.

There are seldom more than two, never more than three Favourites in the running at the same convention. Favourite Sons are more numerous — it is not uncommon to have four or five, or even six, though perhaps not all these are actually started in the race. The number of Dark Horses is practically unlimited, because many talked of beforehand are not actually started, while others not considered before the convention begins are discovered as it goes on. This happened in the leading and most instructive case of James A. Garfield, who was not voted for at all on the first ballot in the Republican convention of 1880, and had, on no ballot up to the thirty-fourth, received more than two votes. On the thirty-sixth[1] he was nominated by 399. So, in 1852, Pierce was scarcely known to the people when he was sprung on the convention. So, in 1868, Horatio Seymour, who had been so little thought of as a candidate that he was chairman of the Democratic convention, was first voted for on the twenty-second ballot. He refused to be nominated, but was induced to leave the chair and nominated on that very ballot.

To carry the analysis farther, it may be observed that four

[1] In 1860 the Democratic convention at Charleston nominated Mr. Douglas on the fifty-seventh ballot.

sets of motives are at work upon those who direct or vote in a convention, acting with different degrees of force on different persons. There is the wish to carry a particular aspirant. There is the wish to defeat a particular aspirant, a wish sometimes stronger than any predilection. There is the desire to get something for one's self out of the struggle — *e.g.* by trading one's vote or influence for the prospect of a Federal office. There is the wish to find the man who, be he good or bad, friend or foe, will give the party its best chance of victory. These motives cross one another, get mixed, vary in relative strength from hour to hour as the convention goes on and new possibilities are disclosed. To forecast their joint effect on the minds of particular persons and sections of a party needs wide knowledge and eminent acuteness. To play upon them is a matter of the finest skill.

The proceedings of a nominating convention can be best understood by regarding the three periods into which they fall: the transactions which precede the opening of its sittings; the preliminary business of passing rules and resolutions and delivering the nominating speeches; and, finally, the balloting.

A President has scarcely been elected before the newspapers begin to discuss his probable successor. Little, however, is done towards the ascertainment of candidates till about a year before the next election, when the factions of the chief aspirants prepare to fall into line, newspapers take up their parable in favour of one or other, and bosses begin the work of "subsoiling," *i.e.* manipulating primaries and local conventions so as to secure the choice of such delegates to the next national convention as they desire. In most of the conventions which appoint delegates, the claims of the several aspirants are canvassed, and the delegates chosen are usually chosen in the interest of one particular aspirant. The newspapers, with their quick sense of what is beginning to stir men's thoughts, redouble their advocacy, and the "boom" of one or two of the probable favourites is thus fairly started. Before the delegates leave their homes for the national convention, most of them have fixed on their candidate, many having indeed received positive instructions as to how their vote shall be cast. All appears to be spontaneous, but in reality both the choice of particular men as delegates, and the instructions given, are usually the result

of untiring underground work among local politicians, directed, or even personally conducted, by two or three skilful agents and emissaries of a leading aspirant, or of the knot which seeks to run him.

Four or five days before the day fixed for the opening of the convention the delegations begin to flock into the city where it is to be held. Some come attended by a host of friends and camp-followers, and are received at the depôt (railway terminus) by the politicians of the city, with a band of music and an admiring crowd. Thus Tammany Hall, the famous Democratic club of New York City, came six hundred strong to Chicago in July, 1884, filling two special trains.[1] A great crowd met it at the station, and it marched, following its Boss, from the cars to its headquarters at the Palmer House in procession, each member wearing his badge, just as the retainers of Earl Warwick the King-maker used to follow him through the streets of London with the Bear and Ragged Staff upon their sleeves. Less than twenty of the six hundred were delegates; the rest ordinary members of the organization, who had accompanied to give it moral and vocal support.[2]

Before the great day dawns many thousands of politicians, newspaper men, and sight-seers have filled to overflowing every hotel in the city, and crowded the main thoroughfares so that the horse-cars can scarcely penetrate the throng. It is like a mediæval pilgrimage, or the mustering of a great army. When the chief delegations have arrived, the work begins in earnest. Not only each large delegation, but the faction of each leading aspirant to the candidacy, has its headquarters, where the managers hold perpetual session, reckoning up their numbers, starting rumours meant to exaggerate their resources, and dishearten their opponents, organizing raids upon the less experienced delegates as they arrive. Some fill the entrance halls and bars of the hotels, talk to the busy reporters, extemporize meetings with tumultuous cheering for their favourite. The common "worker" is good enough to raise the boom by these devices. Meanwhile, the more skilful leaders begin (as it is

[1] The Boss of Tammany was an object of special curiosity to the crowd being the most illustrious professional in the whole United States.

[2] The two other Democratic organizations which then existed in New York City, the County Democracy and Irving Hall, came each in force — the one a regiment of five hundred, the other of two hundred.

expressed) to "plough around" among the delegations of the newer Western and Southern States, usually (at least among the Republicans) more malleable, because they come from regions where the strength of the factions supporting the various aspirants is less accurately known, and are themselves more easily "captured" by bold assertions or seductive promises. Sometimes an expert intriguer will "break into" one of these wavering delegations, and make havoc like a fox in a hen-roost. "Missionaries" are sent out to bring over individuals; embassies are accredited from one delegation to another to endeavour to arrange combinations by coaxing the weaker party to drop its own aspirant, and add its votes to those of the stronger party. All is conducted with perfect order and good-humour, for the least approach to violence would recoil upon its authors; and the only breach of courtesy is where a delegation refuses to receive the ambassadors of an organization whose evil fame has made it odious.

It is against etiquette for the aspirants themselves to appear upon the scene,[1] whether from some lingering respect for the notion that a man must not ask the people to choose him, but accept the proffered honour, or on the principle that the attorney who conducts his own case has a fool for a client. But from Washington, if he is an official or a senator, or perhaps from his own home in some distant State, each aspirant keeps up hourly communication with his managers in the convention city, having probably a private wire laid on for the purpose. Not only may officials, including the President himself, become aspirants, but Federal office-holders may be, and very largely are, delegates, especially among the Southern Republicans when that party is in power.[2] They have the strongest personal interest in the issue; and the heads of departments can, by promises of places, exert a potent influence. One hears in America, just as one used to hear in France under Louis Napoleon or Marshal McMahon, of the "candidate of the Administration."

[1] Oddly enough, the only English parallel to this delicate reserve is to be found in the custom which forbids a candidate for the representation in Parliament of the University of Oxford to approach the University before or during the election.

[2] Not to add that many Southern Republican delegates are supposed to be purchasable.

As the hour when the convention is to open approaches, each faction strains its energy to the utmost. The larger delegations hold meetings to determine their course in the event of the man they chiefly favour proving "unavailable." Conferences take place between different delegations. Lists are published in the newspapers of the strength of each aspirant. Sea and land are compassed to gain one influential delegate, who "owns" other delegates. If he resists other persuasions, he is "switched on" to the private wire of some magnate at Washington, who "talks to him," and suggests inducements more effective than those he has hitherto withstood. The air is thick with tales of plots and treasons, so that no politician trusts his neighbour, for rumour spares none.

At length the period of expectation and preparation is over, and the summer sun rises upon the fateful day to which every politician in the party has looked forward for three years. Long before the time (usually 11 A.M.) fixed for the beginning of business, every part of the hall, erected specially for the gathering — a hall often large enough to hold from ten to fifteen thousand persons — is crowded.[1] The delegates — who in 1892 were 904 in the Republican convention and 909 in the Democratic — are a mere drop in the ocean of faces. Eminent politicians from every State of the Union, senators and representatives from Washington not a few, journalists and reporters, ladies, sight-seers from distant cities, as well as a swarm of partisans from the city itself, press in; some semblance of order being kept by the sergeant-at-arms and his marshals. Some wear devices, sometimes the badge of their State, or of their organization; sometimes the colours or emblem of their favourite aspirant. Each State delegation has its allotted place marked by the flag of the State floating from a pole; but leaders may be seen passing from one group to another, while the spectators listen to the band playing popular airs, and cheer any well-known figure that enters.

When the assembly is "called to order," a prayer is offered — each day's sitting begins with a prayer by some clergyman of local eminence, the susceptibilities of various denominations being duly respected in the selection — and business proceeds

[1] Admission is of course by ticket, and the prices given for tickets to those who, having obtained them, sell them, run high, up to $30, or even $50.

cording to the order described in last chapter. First come
ne preliminaries, appointment of committees and chairmen,
nen the platform, and probably on the second day, but per-
aps later, the nominations and balloting, the latter sometimes
xtending over several days. There is usually both a forenoon
nd an afternoon session.

A European is astonished to see nine hundred men prepare
transact the two most difficult pieces of business an assembly
n undertake, the solemn consideration of their principles, and
ne selection of the person they wish to place at the head of
ne nation, in the sight and hearing of twelve thousand other
en and women. Observation of what follows does not lessen
ne astonishment. The convention presents in sharp contrast
nd frequent alternation. the two most striking features of
mericans in public — their orderliness and their excitability.
verything is done according to strict rule, with a scrupulous
bservance of small formalities which European meetings
ould ignore or despise. Points of order almost too fine for a
rliament are taken, argued, decided on by the chair, to whom
very one bows. Yet the passions that sway the multitude are
nstantly bursting forth in storms of cheering or hissing at
allusion to a favourite aspirant or an obnoxious name, and
ve or six speakers often take the floor together, shouting and
sticulating at each other till the chairman obtains a hearing
r one of them. Of course it depends on the chairman whether
no the convention sinks into a mob. A chairman with a
eak voice, or a want of prompt decision, or a suspicion of
rtisanship, may bring the assembly to the verge of disaster,
d it has more than once happened that when the confusion
at prevailed would have led to an irregular vote which might
ve been subsequently disputed, the action of the manager
ting for the winning horse has, by waiving some point of
der or consenting to an adjournment, saved the party from
sruption. Even in the noisiest scenes the singular good
nse and underlying love of fair play — fair play according
the rules of the game, which do not exclude some dodges
ugnant to an honourable man — will often reassert itself,
d pull back the vehicle from the edge of the precipice.

The chief interest of the earlier proceedings lies in the
lications which speeches and votings give of the relative

strength of the factions. Sometimes a division on the choic of a chairman, or on the adoption of a rule, reveals the ten dencies of the majority, or of influential leaders, in a way which sends the chances of an aspirant swiftly up or down th barometer of opinion. So when the nominating speeches come it is not so much their eloquence that helps a nominee as th warmth with which the audience receives them, the volume o cheering and the length of time, sometimes fifteen minutes during which the transport lasts. As might be guessed from the size of the audience which he addresses, an orator is ex pected to "soar into the blue empyrean" at once. The rhetori is usually pompous and impassioned. To read a speech, eve a short speech, from copious notes, is neither irregular nc rare.

While forenoon and evening, perhaps even late evening, ar occupied with the sittings of the convention, canvassing an intrigue go on more briskly than ever during the rest of th day and night. Conferences are held between delegation anxious to arrange for a union of forces on one candidate Divided delegations hold meetings of their own members, mee ings often long and stormy, behind closed doors, outside whic a curious crowd listens to the angry voices within, and snatche at the reports which the dispersing members give of the resul Sometimes the whole issue of the convention hinges on th action of the delegates of a great State, which, like New Yorl under the unit rule, can throw seventy-two votes into th trembling scale. It has even happened, although this against a well-settled custom, that a brazen aspirant himse goes the round of several delegations and tries to harangu them into supporting him.

As it rarely happens that any aspirant is able to command

[1] In the Democratic convention of 1884 it was well known that the choi of Mr. Cleveland, the leading Favourite, would depend on the action of t delegation of New York State, not only, however, because it cast the large vote, but because it was his own State, and because it was already forese that the presidential election would turn on the electoral vote of New Yor Thus the struggle in the convention came to be really a duel between M Cleveland and the Boss of Tammany, with whom Mr. Cleveland had at earlier period in his career "locked horns." In 1892, however, Mr. Clevela was strong enough to win on the first ballot against the vote of the New Yo delegation which was given to the Boss of the State who had lately been governor and was in league with the then Boss of Tammany.

arting a majority of the whole convention, the object of each
tc arrange a combination whereby he may gather from the
ipporters of other aspirants votes sufficient to make up the
equisite majority, be it two-thirds, according to the Democratic
ule, or a little more than a half, according to the Republican.
et us take the total number of votes at 820 — the figure in
888. There are usually two aspirants commanding each from
30 to 330; one or two others with from 50 to 100, and the
est with much smaller figures, 10 to 30 each. A combination
an succeed in one of two ways: (*a*) One of the stronger aspir-
nts may pick up votes, sometimes quickly, sometimes by slow
egrees, from the weaker candidates, sufficient to overpower the
val Favourite; (*b*) Each of the strongest aspirants may hold
s forces so well together that after repeated ballotings it be-
omes clear that neither can win against the resistance of the
her. Neither faction will, however, give way, because there
usually bitterness between them, because each would feel
umiliated, and because each aspirant has so many friends that
s patronage will no more than suffice for the clients to whom
e is pledged already. Hence one or other of the baffled Favour-
es suddenly transfers the votes he commands to some one
the weaker men, who then so rapidly "develops strength"
at the rest of the minor factions go over to him, and he obtains
e requisite majority.[1] Experience has so well prepared the
cticians for one or other of these issues that the game is
ways played with a view to them. The first effort of the
anagers of a Favourite is to capture the minor groups of
legates who support one or other of the Favourite Sons and
ark Horses. Not till this proves hopeless do they decide to
ll themselves as dear as they can by taking up and carrying
victory a Dark Horse or perhaps even a Favourite Son,
ereby retaining the pleasure of defeating the rival Favourite,
nile at the same time establishing a claim for themselves and
eir faction on the aspirant whom they carry.[2]

[1] Suppose A and B, Favourites, to have each 300 votes. After some ballotings, s friends, perceiving they cannot draw enough of the votes commanded by D, and F (who have each 60), and of G and H (who have each 20) to win, ve their 300 votes to F. This gives him so considerable a lead that C, D, d G go over to him on the next ballot; he has then 440, and either wins at ce (Republican rule) or will win next ballot (Democratic rule).

[2] It will be understood that while the Favourites and Favourite Sons are

It may be asked why a Dark Horse often prevails against the Favourites, seeing that either of the latter has a much larger number of delegates in his favour. Ought not the wish of a very large group to have so much weight with the minor groups as to induce them to come over and carry the man whom a powerful section of the party obviously desires? The reason why this does not happen is that a Favourite is often as much hated by one strong section as he is liked by another, and if the hostile section is not strong enough to keep him out by its unaided vote, it is sure to be able to do so by transferring itself to some other aspirant. Moreover, a Favourite has often less chance with the minor groups than a Dark Horse may have. He has not the charm of novelty. His "ins and outs" are known; the delegations weighed his merits before they left their own State, and if they, or the State convention that instructed them, decided against him then, they are slow to adopt him now. They have formed a habit of "antagonizing" him whereas they have no hostility to some new and hitherto inconspicuous aspirant.

Let us now suppose resolutions and nominating speeches despatched, and the curtain raised for the third act of the convention. The chairman raps loudly with his gavel,[1] announcing the call of States for the vote. A hush falls on the multitude, a long deep breath is drawn, tally books are opened and pencils grasped, while the clerk reads slowly the names of State after State. As each is called, the chairman of its delegation rises and announces the votes it gives, bursts of cheering from each faction in the audience welcoming the votes given to the object of its wishes. Inasmuch as the disposition of most of the delegates has become known beforehand, not only to the managers but to the public through the press, the loudest welcome is given to a delegate or delegation whose vote turns out better than had been predicted.

In the first scene of this third and decisive act the Favourite

before the convention from the first, some of the Dark Horses may not appear as aspirants till well on in the balloting. They may be persons who have never been thought of before as possible candidates. There is therefore always a great element of exciting uncertainty.

[1] The gavel is a sort of auctioneer's hammer used by a chairman to call the attention of the meeting to what he is saying or to restore order. That used at a national convention is often made of pieces of wood from every State.

ave, of course, the leading parts. Their object is to produce n impression of overwhelming strength, so the whole of this rength is displayed, unless, as occasionally happens, an astute anager holds back a few votes. This is also the bright hour the Favourite Sons. Each receives the vote of his State, but ch usually finds that he has little to expect from external lp, and his friends begin to consider into what other camp ey had better march over. The Dark Horses are in the back- ound, nor is it yet possible to say which (if any) of them ill come to the front.

The first ballot seldom decides much, yet it gives a new pect to the battle-field, for the dispositions of some groups of ters who had remained doubtful is now revealed, and the anagers of each aspirant are better able to tell, from the way which certain delegations are divided, in what quarters they e most likely to gain or lose votes on the subsequent ballots. ney whisper hastily together, and try, in the few moments ey have before the second ballot is upon them, to prepare me new line of defence or attack.

The second ballot, taken in the same way, sometimes reveals en more than the first. The smaller and more timid delega- ns, smitten with the sense of their weakness, despairing of eir own aspirant, and anxious to be on the winning side, begin give way; or if this does not happen on the second ballot, may do so on the third. Rifts open in their ranks, individ- ls or groups of delegates go over to one of the stronger can- dates, some having all along meant to do so, and thrown their st vote merely to obey instructions received or fulfil the letter a promise given. The gain of even twenty or thirty votes r one of the leading candidates over his strength on the pre- ding ballot so much inspirits his friends, and is so likely to ing fresh recruits to his standard, that a wily manager will ten, on the first ballot, throw away some of his votes on a rmless antagonist that he may by rallying them increase the al of his candidate on the second, and so convey the impres- n of growing strength.

The breathing space between each ballot and that which lows is used by the managers for hurried consultations. des-de-camp are sent to confirm a wavering delegation, or to ge one which has been supporting a now hopeless aspirant

to seize this moment for dropping him and coming over to the winning standard. Or the aspirant himself, who, hundreds o miles away, sits listening to the click of the busy wires, i told how matters stand, and asked to advise forthwith wha course his friends shall take. Forthwith it must be, for th next ballot is come, and may give the battle-field a new aspect promising victory or presaging irretrievable defeat.

Any one who has taken part in an election, be it the electio of a pope by cardinals, of a town-clerk by the city council, of fellow by the dons of a college, of a schoolmaster by the boar of trustees, of a pastor by a congregation, knows how muc depends on generalship. In every body of electors there ar men who have no minds of their own; others who cannot mak up their minds till the decisive moment, and are determined b the last word or incident; others whose wavering inclinatio yields to the pressure or follows the example of a stronger co league. There are therefore chances of running in by surpris an aspirant whom few may have desired, but still fewer hav positively disliked, chances specially valuable when contro versy has spent itself between two equally matched competi tors, so that the majority are ready to jump at a new suggestion The wary tactician awaits his opportunity; he improves th brightening prospects of his aspirant to carry him with a ru before the opposition is ready with a counter move; or if h sees a strong antagonist, he invents pretexts for delay till h has arranged a combination by which that antagonist may b foiled. Sometimes he will put forward an aspirant destine to be abandoned, and reserve till several votings have bee taken the man with whom he means to win. All these arts ar familiar to the convention manager, whose power is seen no merely in the dealing with so large a number of individual and groups whose dispositions he must grasp and remembe but in the cool promptitude with which he decides on h course amid the noise and passion and distractions of twelv thousand shouting spectators. Scarcely greater are the facu ties of combination and coolness of head needed by a gener in the midst of a battle, who has to bear in mind the positio of every one of his own corps and to divine the positions o those of the enemy's corps which remain concealed, who mu vary his plan from hour to hour according to the success o

ailure of each of his movements and the new facts that are uccessively disclosed, and who does all this under the roar nd through the smoke of cannon.

One balloting follows another till what is called "the break" omes. It comes when the weaker factions, perceiving that the ien of their first preference cannot succeed, transfer their votes o that one among the aspirants whom they like best, or whose trength they see growing. When the faction of one aspirant as set the example, others are quick to follow, and thus it may appen that after thirty or forty ballots have been taken with ew changes of strength as between the two leading competitors, single ballot, once the break has begun, and the column of one both of these competitors has been "staggered," decides the attle.

If one Favourite is much stronger from the first than any her, the break may come soon and come gently, *i.e.* each ballot nows a gain for him on the preceding ballot, and he marches o steadily to victory that resistance is felt to be useless. But two well-matched rivals have maintained the struggle through venty or thirty ballots, so that the long strain has wrought up l minds to unwonted excitement, the break, when it comes, omes with fierce intensity, like that which used to mark the harge of the Old Guard. The defeat becomes a rout. Bat- lion after battalion goes over to the victors, while the van- uished, ashamed of their candidate, try to conceal themselves throwing away their colours and joining in the cheers that claim the conqueror. In the picturesquely technical language politicians, it is a Stampede.

To stampede a convention is the steadily contemplated aim every manager who knows he cannot win on the first ballot.[1] e enjoys it as the most dramatic form of victory, he values it cause it evokes an enthusiasm whose echo reverberates all er the Union, and dilates the party heart with something like at sense of supernatural guidance which Rome used to have hen the cardinals chose a pope by the sudden inspiration of

[1] To check stampeding, the Republican convention of 1876 adopted a rule oviding that the roll-call of States should in no case be dispensed with. This kes surprise and tumult less dangerous. (See Stanwood's useful *History Presidential Elections.*) With the same view, the Republican convention 1888 ruled that no vote given on any balloting should be changed before the d of that balloting.

the Holy Spirit. Sometimes it comes of itself, when various delegations, smitten at the same moment by the sense that one of the aspirants is destined to conquer, go over to him all at once.[1] Sometimes it is due to the action of the aspirant himself. In 1880 Mr. Blaine, who was one of the two leading Favourites, perceiving that he could not be carried against the resistance of the Grant men, suddenly telegraphed to his friends to transfer their votes to General Garfield, till then a scarcely considered candidate. In 1884 General Logan, also by telegraph, turned over his votes to Mr. Blaine between the third and fourth ballot, thereby assuring the already probable triumph of that Favourite.

When a stampede is imminent, only one means exists of averting it, — that of adjourning the convention so as to stop the panic and gain time for a combination against the winning aspirant. A resolute manager always tries this device, but he seldom succeeds, for the winning side resists the motion for adjournment, and the vote which it casts on that issue is practically a vote for its aspirant, against so much of the field as has any fight left in it. This is the most critical and exciting moment of the whole battle. A dozen speakers rise at once, some to support, some to resist the adjournment, some to protest against debate upon it, some to take points of order, few of which can be heard over the din of the howling multitude. Meanwhile, the managers who have kept their heads rush swiftly about through friendly delegations, trying at this supreme moment to rig up a combination which may resist the advancing tempest. Tremendous efforts are made to get the second Favourite's men to abandon their chief and "swing into line" for some Dark Horse or Favourite Son, with whose votes they may make head till other factions rally to them.

> "In vain, in vain, the all-consuming hour
> Relentless falls —"

The battle is already lost, the ranks are broken and cannot be rallied, nothing remains for brave men but to cast their last votes against the winner and fall gloriously around their still

[1] Probably a Dark Horse, for the Favourite Sons, having had their turn in the earlier ballotings, have been discounted; and are apt to excite more jealousy among the delegates of other States.

waving banner. The motion to adjourn is defeated, and the ext ballot ends the strife with a hurricane of cheering for the hosen leader. Then a sudden calm falls on the troubled sea. What is done is done, and whether done for good or for ill, the est face must be put upon it. Accordingly, the proposer of one f the defeated aspirants moves that the nomination be made nanimous, and the more conspicuous friends of other aspirants asten to show their good-humour and their loyalty to the party s a whole by seconding this proposition. Then, perhaps, a igantic portrait of the candidate, provided by anticipation, is oisted up, a signal for fresh enthusiasm, or a stuffed eagle is arried in procession round the hall.

Nothing further remains but to nominate a candidate for the ice-presidency, a matter of small moment now that the great ssue has been settled. This nomination is frequently used to onsole one of the defeated aspirants for the presidential nom- nation, or is handed over to his friends to be given to some olitician of their choice. If there be a contest, it is seldom rolonged beyond two or three ballots. The convention is at n end, and in another day the whole host of exhausted dele- ates and camp-followers, hoarse with shouting, is streaming ome along the railways.

The fever heat of the convention is almost matched by that f the great cities, and indeed of every spot over the Union to hich there runs an electric wire. Every incident, speech, vote, instantly telegraphed to all the cities. Crowds gather round ne newspaper offices, where frequent editions are supple- ented by boards displaying the latest bulletins. In Wash- gton, Congress can hardly be kept together, because every olitician is personally interested in every move of the game. When at last the result is announced, the partisans of the nosen candidate go wild with delight; salvos of artillery are red off, processions with bands parade the streets, ratification eetings are announced for the same evening, "campaign ubs" bearing the candidate's name are organized on the spot. he excitement is of course greatest in the victor's own State, in the city where he happens to be resident. A crowd ushes to his house, squeezes his hand to a quivering pulp, ongratulates him on being virtually President, while the keen- ved reporter telegraphs far and wide how he smiled and spoke

when the news was brought. Defeated aspirants telegraph to their luckier rival their congratulations on his success, promising him support in the campaign. Interviewers fly to prominent politicians, and cross-examine them as to what they think of the nomination. But in two days all is still again, and a lull of exhaustion follows till the real business of the contest begins some while later with the issue of the letter of acceptance, in which the candidate declares his views and outlines his policy.

CHAPTER LXXI

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

A PRESIDENTIAL election in America is something to which Europe can show nothing similar. Though the issues which fall to be decided by the election of a Chamber in France or Italy, or of a House of Commons in England, are often far graver than those involved in the choice of A or B to be executive chief magistrate for four years, the commotion and excitement, the amount of "organization," of speaking, writing, telegraphing, and shouting, is incomparably greater in the United States. It is only the salient features of these contests that I shall attempt to sketch, for the detail is infinite.

The canvass usually lasts about four months. It begins soon after both of the great parties have chosen their candidate, *i.e.* before the middle of July; and it ends early in November, on the day when the presidential electors are chosen simultaneously in and by all the States. The summer heats and the absence of the richer sort of people at the seaside or mountain resorts keep down the excitement during July and August; it rises in September, and boils furiously through October.

The first step is for each nominated candidate to accept his nomination in a letter, sometimes as long as a pamphlet, setting forth his views of the condition of the nation and the policy which the times require. Such a letter is meant to strike the keynote for the whole orchestra of orators. It is, of course, published everywhere, extolled by friendly and dissected by hostile journals. Together with the "platform" adopted at the national party convention, it is the official declaration of party principles, to be referred to as putting the party case, no less than the candidate himself, before the nation.

While the candidate is composing his address, the work of organization goes briskly forward, for in American elections

everything is held to depend on organization. A central or national party committee nominated by the national convention, and consisting of one member from each State, gets its members together and forms a plan for the conduct of the canvass. It raises money by appealing to the wealthy and zealous men of the party for subscriptions, and, of course, presses those above all who have received something in the way of an office or other gratification from the party.[1] It communicates with the leading statesmen and orators of the party, and arranges in what district of the country each shall take the stump. It issues shoals of pamphlets, and forms relations with party newspapers. It allots grants from the "campaign fund" to particular persons and State committees, to be spent by them for "campaign purposes," an elastic term which covers a good deal of illicit expenditure. Enormous sums are gathered and disbursed by this committee, and the accounts submitted do not, as may be supposed, answer all the questions they suggest. The committee directs its speakers and its funds chiefly to the doubtful States, those in which eloquence or expenditure may turn the balance either way. There are seldom more than six or seven such States at any one election, possibly fewer.

The efforts of the national committee are seconded not only by State committees, but by an infinite number of minor organizations over the country, in the rural districts no less than in the cities. Some of these are permanent. Others are created for the election alone; and as they contemplate a short life, they make it a merry one. These "campaign clubs," which usually bear the candidates' names, are formed on every imaginable basis, that of locality, of race, of trade or profession, of university affiliation. There are Irish clubs, Italian clubs, German clubs, Scandinavian clubs, Polish clubs, coloured (*i.e.* negro) clubs, Orange clubs. There are young men's clubs, lawyers' clubs, dry-goods clubs, insurance men's clubs, shoe and leather clubs. There are clubs of the graduates of various colleges. Their work consists in canvassing the voters, making up lists of friends, opponents, and doubtfuls, getting up pro-

[1] As a recent statute forbids the levying of assessments for party purposes on members of the Federal civil service, it is deemed prudent to have no Federal official on the committee, lest in demanding subscriptions from his subordinates he should transgress the law.

essions and parades, holding meetings, and generally "booming ll the time."

This is mostly unpaid labour. But there are also thousands f paid agents at work, canvassing, distributing pamphlets or eaflets, lecturing on behalf of the candidate. It is in America o reproach to a political speaker that he receives a fee or a alary. Even men of eminence are permitted to receive not nly their travelling expenses, but a round sum. Whether the andidate himself takes the field depends on his popular gifts. f he is a brilliant speaker, his services are too valuable to be ost; and he is sent on a tour through the doubtful States, where e speaks for weeks together twice or thrice on most days, fill- ng up the intervals with "receptions" at which he has to hake hands with hundreds of male callers, and be presented o ladies scarcely less numerous.[1] The leading men of the arty are, of course, pressed into the service. Even if they islike and have opposed the nomination of the particular can- idate, party loyalty and a lively sense of favours to come force hem to work for the person whom the party has chosen. An minent Irishman or an eminent German is especially valuable or a stumping tour, because he influences the vote of his coun- rymen. Similarly each senator is expected to labour assidu- usly at his own State, where presumably his influence is reatest, and any refusal to do so is deemed a pointed disap- roval of the candidate.

The committees print and distribute great quantities of cam- aign literature, pamphlets, speeches, letters, leaflets, and one an believe that this printed matter is more serviceable than it ould be in England, because a larger part of the voters live in uiet country places, and like something to read in the evening. ven novelettes are composed in the interests of a candidate, herein lovers talk about tariffs under the moon. Sometimes less ingenuous use is made of the press. On the very eve of ection of 1880, too late for a contradiction to obtain equal ublicity, a forged letter, purporting to come from Mr. Garfield, nd expressing views on Chinese immigration and labour, dis- steful to the Pacific States, was lithographed and scattered roadcast over California, where it told heavily against him.

[1] Sometimes he stumps along a line of railroad, making ten-minute speeches om the end platform of the last car.

Most constant and effective of all is the action of the newspapers. The chief journals have for two or three months a daily leading article recommending their own and assailing the hostile candidate, with a swarm of minor editorial paragraphs bearing on the election. Besides these there are reports of speeches delivered, letters to the editor with the editor's comments at the end, stories about the candidates, statements as to the strength of each party in particular States, counties and cities. An examination of a few of the chief newspapers during the months of September and October, 1884, showed that their "campaign matter" of all kinds formed between one-half and one-third of the total letterpress of the papers (excluding advertisements), and this, be it remembered, every day during those two months. The most readable part of this matter consists in the reports of the opinion of individual persons, more or less prominent, on the candidate. You find, for instance, a paragraph stating that the Rev. Dr. A., president of such and such a college, or Mr. B., the philanthropist who is head of the Y Z Bank, or ex-Governor C., or Judge D. has said he thinks the candidate a model of chivalric virtue or fit only for a felon's cell, as the case may be, and that he will vote for or against him accordingly.[1] Occasionally the prominent man is called on by an interviewer and gives a full statement of his views, or he writes to a young friend who has asked his advice in a private letter, which is immediately published. The abundance of these expressions or citations of the opinions of private citizens supplies a curious evidence of the disposition of some sections in a democracy to look up to its intellectual and moral leaders. For the men thus appealed to are nearly all persons eminent by their character, ability, learning, or success in business; the merely rich man is cited but rarely, and as if his opinion did not matter, though of course his subscription may. Judges and lawyers, universit

[1] Sometimes a sort of amateur census is taken of the persons occupied in one place in some particular employment, as, for instance, of the professors in a particular college, or even of the clerks in a particular store, these being taken as samples of store-clerks or professors generally; and the party organ triumphantly claims that three-fourths of their votes will be cast for its candidate. Among the "throbs of Connecticut's pulse," I recollect an estimate of the "proclivities" of the workmen in the Willimantic mills in the State.

lignitaries and literary men, are, next to the clergy,[1] the persons most often quoted.

The function of the clergy in elections is very characteristic f the country and the occasion. They used during the period rom 1820 to 1856 to give politics a wide berth, for not only vould their advocacy of any particular cause have offended a ection among their flocks, but the general sentiment condemned he immixture in politics of a clerical element. The struggle gainst slavery, being a moral issue, brought them into more requent public activity. Since the close of that struggle they ave again tended to retire. However, the excitement of a residential election suspends all rules; and when questions ffecting the moral character of the candidates are involved, lerical intervention is deemed natural. Thus in the contest f 1884, the newspapers were full of the opinions of clergymen. Sermons were reported if they seemed to bear upon he issue. Paragraphs appeared saying that such and such a astor would carry three-fourths of his congregation with him, vhereas the conduct of another in appearing at a meeting on ehalf of the opposing candidate was much blamed by his lock. Not many ministers actually took the platform, though here was a general wish to have them as chairmen. But one, he late Mr. Henry Ward Beecher, did great execution by his owerful oratory, artillery all the more formidable because it vas turned against the candidate of the party to which he had hrough his long life belonged. Nor was there any feature in he canvass of that same candidate more remarkable than the ssembly of 1018 clergymen of all denominations (including a ewish rabbi), which gathered at the Fifth Avenue Hotel in ew York, to meet him and assure him of their support on noral grounds immediately before the election day.[2]

[1] An eminent Unitarian clergyman having written a letter condemning a andidate, the leading organ of that candidate in sneering at it, remarked that fter all, Dr. Clarke's coachman's vote was as good as Dr. Clarke's; to which was rejoined that hundreds of voters would follow Dr. Clarke, and hundreds ore be offended at this disrespectful reference to him.

[2] One of the clerical speakers spoke of the opposite candidate as receiving he support of "rum, Romanism, and rebellion." This phrase, eagerly caught p, and repeated by hostile newspapers, incensed the Roman Catholics of New ork, and was even believed to have turned the election against the candidate whose interest the alliteration was invented. Nothing so dangerous as a iend.

From a class usually excluded from politics by custom to a class excluded by law, the transition is easy. Women as a rule (setting aside the two woman suffrage Western States) keep as much aloof from electoral contests in America as in continental Europe, and certainly more than in England, for I have never heard of their forming an organization to canvass the voters of a district in America, as the (Conservative) Primrose League and the Women's Liberal Associations do in England. Nor are women appointed delegates from any ward primary,[1] as they have lately been in several places in England. However, the excitement of a close struggle sometimes draws even women into the vortex. Receptions are tendered by the ladies of each party to the candidate, and are reported in the public press as politically significant, while among the letters which appear in the newspapers not a few bear female signatures.

Speaking and writing and canvassing are common to elections all over the world. What is peculiar to America is the amazing development of the "demonstration" as a means for raising enthusiasm. For three months, processions, usually with brass bands, flags, badges, crowds of cheering spectators are the order of the day and night from end to end of the country. The Young Men's Pioneer Club of a village in the woods of Michigan turns out in the summer evening; the Democrats or Republicans of Chicago or Philadelphia leave their business to march through the streets of these great cities many thousand strong.

When a procession is exceptionally large, it is called a Parade. In New York City, on the 29th of October, 1884, the business men who supported Mr. James Gillespie Blaine held such a demonstration. They were organized by profession or occupation: the lawyers, eight hundred strong, forming one battalion, the dry-goods men another, the Produce Exchange a third, the bankers a fourth, the brokers a fifth, the jewellers a sixth, the Petroleum Exchange a seventh, and so on *ad infinitum*. They started from the Bowling-green near the south end of Manhattan Island, and marched right up the city

[1] Women, however, appear as delegates at the conventions of the Prohibition party: and there have been instances in which they have been admitted as delegates to a Republican state convention in Massachusetts.

ong Broadway to Madison Square, where Mr. Blaine reviewed
d addressed them. Rain fell incessantly, and the streets
ere deep with mud, but neither rain above nor mud below
mped the spirits of this great army, which tramped steadily
ong, chanting various "campaign refrains," such as

"Five, Five, Five Cent Fare;" [1]

t most frequently

"Blaine, Blaine, James G. Blaine,
We don't care a bit for the rain,
O—O—O—O—HI—O." [2]

There were said to have been 25,000 business men in this
rade, which was followed soon after by another more miscel-
neous Blaine parade of 60,000 Republicans, as well as (of
urse) by counter parades of Democrats. A European, who
nds amazed at the magnitude of these demonstrations, is apt
ask whether the result attained is commensurate with the
ney, time, and effort given to them. His American friends
swer that, as with advertising, it is not to be supposed that
ewd and experienced men would thus spend their money
less convinced that the expenditure was reproductive. The
ade and procession business, the crowds, the torches, the
lges, the flags, the shouting, all this pleases the participants by
king them believe they are effecting something; it impresses
spectators by showing them that other people are in earnest,
strikes the imagination of those who in country hamlets
d of the doings in the great city. In short, it keeps up the
oom," and an American election is held to be, truly or
ely, largely a matter of booming.
f the cynical visitor smiles at these displays, he is con-
ined to admire the good-humour and good order which
vail. Neither party in the Northern, Middle, and Western
tes dreams of disturbing the parades or meetings of the
er. You might believe, from the acclamations which accom-

[1] Mr. Cleveland had, as Governor of New York State, vetoed as unconstitu-
al a bill establishing a uniform fare of 5 cents on the New York City
ated railroads. This act was supposed to have alienated the working men
ruined his presidential prospects.
[2] In the State elections held in Ohio shortly beforehand, the Republicans
been victorious, and the omen was gladly caught up.

pany a procession, that the whole population was with it, for opponents are present, they do not hoot or hiss, and there a always enough sympathizers to cheer. During the hotly co tested elections of 1880, 1884, 1888, and 1892, hardly any c lisions or disturbances were reported from California to Main Even in Virginia, Maryland, Missouri, where the old Southe party is apt to let its angry passions rise against the negro and their white Republican allies, the breaches of order we neither numerous nor serious. Over four-fifths of the Southe States perfect quiet prevailed. It is true that one party cou there count on an overwhelming majority, so that there w no excuse for the one to bully nor any inducement for t other to show fight.

The maxim that nothing succeeds like success is nowhere cordially and consistently accepted as in America. It is t corner-stone of all election work. The main effort of a can date's orators and newspapers is to convince the people th their side is the winning one, for there are sure to be plenty voters anxious to be on that side, not so much from any a vantage to be gained for themselves as because reverence f "the People" makes them believe that the majority are rig Hence the exertions to prove that the Germans, or the Iri or the working men are going for candidate X or candidate Hence the reports of specimen canvasses showing that per cent of the clerks in a particular bank or 80 per cent the professors in a particular theological college have declar themselves for X. Hence the announcements of the betting od for a particular candidate, and the assertion that the supporte of the other man who had put large sums on him are now ginning to hedge.[1] But the best evidence to which a party c appeal is its winning minor elections which come off shor before the great presidential one. In two States the choice a governor and other State officers took place, till lately, wit the month prior to the 8th of November, in two or three it s takes place in September. If the State is a safe one for Republicans or the Democrats (as the case may be), the vo

[1] There is a great deal of betting on elections, so much that bribery is o alleged to be practised by those who are heavily involved. The constituti or statutes of some States make it an offence to give or take a bet on election.

ast are compared with those cast at the last preceding simi-
ar election, and the inference drawn that one or other party is
aining. If it is a doubtful State, the interest is still more keen,
nd every nerve is strained to carry an election whose issue will
resage, and by presaging contribute to, success in the presi-
ential struggle. Possibly the candidate or some of his ablest
peakers stump this State; probably also it is drenched with
oney. The inferences from such a contest may be thought
ncertain, because State elections are always complicated with
ocal questions, and with the character of the particular candi-
ates for State offices. But it is a maxim among politicians
hat in a presidential year local issues vanish, the voters being
o warmed with party spirit that they go solid for their party
n spite of all local or personal obstacles. The truth of this
iew was illustrated by the fact that Ohio often returns a
ajority of Democrats to Congress and has a Democratic major-
y in her own legislature, but has for several elections given a
ajority for the presidential candidate of the Republican party.
he eagerness shown to carry the October elections in this great
nd often doubtful State used to be scarcely second to that dis-
layed in the presidential contest. She has now (and Indiana
kewise) put her fall elections later, and makes them coincide
every second term) with the presidential election, in order to
void the tremendous strain which they had been forced to bear.
efore this change it was often made an argument why the
arty should select its candidate from Ohio, that this would
ve a better chance of winning the preliminary canter, and
hereby securing the advantage of a presageful victory.[1]

So far I have described the contest as one between two
arties and two candidates only. But it is usually complicated
r the appearance of other minor parties and minor candidates
ho, although they have no chance of success, affect the main
ruggle by drawing off strength from one side or the other.

[1] There is a touch of superstition in the value set in America upon the first
lications of the popular sentiment, like that which made the Romans attach
ch weight to the vote of the century first called up to vote in the *comitia*
turiata. It was selected by lot, perhaps not merely because the advantage
calling first a century which he might know to be favourable to his own
w or candidate was too great a one to be left to the presiding magistrate,
t also because its declaration was thus deemed to be an indication of the
ll of the gods who governed the lot.

In the last four elections the Prohibitionist party and th Greenback (now the Labour) party each held a national conve tion, nominated candidates for presidency and vice-presidenc and obtained at the polls a number of votes far too small t carry any single State, and therefore, of course, too small t choose any presidential electors, but sufficient to affect, perha to turn, the balance of strength between Republicans and Dem crats in two or three of the doubtful States. The Prohibitioni candidate has drawn most of his votes from the Republica side; the Greenbacker or Labour man from the Democrati hence there is apt to be a sort of tacit alliance during the can paign between the Republican organs and the Labour part between the Democratic organs and the Prohibitionist; an conversely much ill blood between Republicans and Prohib tionists, between Democrats and Labour men. Any one ca see what an opening for intrigue is given by these complic tions, recently increased by the appearance on the scene of th "People's Party," and how much they add to the difficulty predicting the result of the contest. The area of that conte is a continent, and in the various regions of the continent force different in nature and varying in strength are at work.

CHAPTER LXXII

THE ISSUES IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Upon what does a presidential election turn? The presidenl candidate has a double character. He is put forward as ing individually qualified for the great place of executive head the nation, because he is a man of integrity, energy, firmness, ellectual power, experience in affairs. He is also recomended as a prominent member of a great national party, spired by its traditions. devoted to its principles, and prepared carry them out not only in his properly executive capacity, t, what is more important, as virtually a third branch of the islature, armed with a veto on bills passed by Congress. His ction may therefore be advocated or opposed either on the ound of his personal qualities or of his political professions l party affiliations. Here we have a marked difference ween the American and European systems, because in Engd, France, Germany, and Italy, elections turn chiefly on the ws of the parties, secondarily on the character of individual ders, seeing that the leaders are not chosen directly by the ople, but are persons who have come to the top in the legisures of those countries, or have been (in Germany) raised to ce by the Crown. In America, therefore, we have a source of ssible confusion between issues of two wholly distinct kinds those which affect the personal qualifications of the candie, and those which regard the programme of his party.

Whether, in any given presidential election, the former or latter class of issues are the more conspicuous and decisive, ends partly on the political questions which happen to be n before the people, partly on the more or less marked inidiuality of the rival candidates. From about 1850 down to 6, questions, first of the extension of slavery, then of its inction, then of the reconstruction of the Union, had divided

the nation, and made every contest a contest of principles an of practical measures. Since the controversies raised by th war have been settled, there have been few real differences o political principle between the parties, and questions of pe sonal fitness have therefore become relatively more importan

The object of each party naturally is to put forward as man good political issues as it can, claiming for itself the merit o having always been on the popular side. Any one who shoul read the campaign literature of the Republicans would fanc that they were opposed to the Democrats on many importan points. When he took up the Democratic speeches and pam phlets, he would be again struck by the serious divergence between the parties, which, however, would seem to arise, no on the points raised by the Republicans, but on other point which the Republicans had not referred to. In other words the aim of each party is to force on its antagonist certain issue which the antagonist rarely accepts, so that although there is vast deal of discussion and declamation on political topics, ther are few on which either party directly traverses the doctrine of the other. Each pummels, not his true enemy, but a stuffe figure set up to represent that enemy. During the presidenti elections of 1880 and 1884, for instance, the Republicans sough to force to the front the issue of Protection *versus* Free Trad which the Democrats refused to accept, having avowed Pr tectionists within their own ranks, and knowing that the bul of the nation was (at most) prepared only for certain reduction in the tariff. Thus while Republican orators were advocatin a protective tariff on a thousand platforms, hardly a Democr ventured to refer to the subject except by saying that he woul not refer to it. Both sides declared against monopolists and th power of corporations. Both professed to be the friends of civ service reform. Both promised to protect the rights of th Americans all over the world, to withstand Bismarck in h attacks on American bacon, and to rescue American citizen from British dungeons. Both, however, were equally zealou for peace and good-will among the nations, and had no idea quarrelling with any European power. These appeals and pr fessions made no great impression upon the voters. Th American, like the Englishman, usually votes with his part right or wrong, and when there is little distinction of vie

etween the parties it becomes all the easier to stick to your ld friends. The tariff issue, however, told somewhat in favour f the Republicans; and while the Southern men voted against ne Republican party because it was the party which had arried on the war and crushed Secession, the bulk of the North oted for that party for the same reason. It was by associaions from the past rather than by arguments on the present nd the future that men's action was determined.

The next election, that of 1888, is remarkable for the fact hat the victory of the party which had been defeated in 1884 as mainly due to a personal intrigue, a secret "deal," which believed to have turned over from the Democrats to the epublicans the thirty-six electoral votes of New York State. n the contest of 1892 the Democrats imitated the Republican actics of 1884 by attacking the latter party upon an issue (that f the Federal Elections or so-called "Force" Bill) which the epublicans had carefully avoided, and which they refused to ccept. The protective tariff did on this occasion raise a efinite issue and materially affect the result. But as regards urrency questions, profound and important as they were, the platforms" of the two great parties differed but slightly, and either could command the allegiance to its platform of the hole of its rank and file. In particular the strange spectacle as presented of a candidate avowing strong and clear views, ho found himself in this weighty matter more in accordance ith the bulk of his Republican opponents than with a large ction of his Democratic supporters.

When political controversy is languid, personal issues come the front. They are in one sense small, but not for that ason less exciting. Whoever has sat in any body of men, om a college debating society up to a legislative chamber, nows that no questions raise so much warmth, and are ebated with so much keenness as questions affecting the aracter and conduct of individual men. They evoke some what is best and much of what is worst in human nature. a presidential election it is impossible to avoid discussing e personal merits of the candidates, because much depends those merits. It has also proved impossible to set limits the discussion. Unmitigated publicity is a condition of ninence in America; and the excitement in one of these

contests rises so high that (at elections in which personal issues are prominent) the canons of decorum which American custom at other times observes, are cast aside by speakers and journalists. The air is thick with charges, defences, recriminations, till the voter knows not what to believe.

These censures are referable to three classes. One includes what is called the candidate's "war record." To have been disloyal to the Union in the hour of its danger is a reproach. To have fought for the North, still more to have led a Northern regiment or division, covers a multitude of sins. It is the greatest of blessings for America that she fights so seldom, for in no country do military achievements carry a candidate farther, not that the people love war, for they do not, but because success in a sphere so remote from their ordinary life touches their imagination, marks a man out from his fellows, associates his name with their passionate patriotism, gives him a claim on the gratitude, not of a party, but of the nation as a whole. His prowess in repulsing the British troops at New Orleans made Andrew Jackson twice President, in spite of grave faults of temper and judgment. Some Indian skirmishes fixed the choice of the Whig party in 1840 upon William H. Harrison, though his competitor for the nomination was Henry Clay. Zachary Taylor was known only by his conduct of the Mexican War, when he was elected by the same party in 1848. The failure of General Grant as President in his first term, a failure which those who most heartily recognized his honour and patriotism could not deny, did not prevent his re-election in 1872; and the memory of his services came near to giving him a third nomination in 1880.

More serious, however, than the absence of a war record, are charges of the second class — those impeaching the nominee's personal integrity. These no candidate need hope to escape. Few men can have passed years in a State legislature or State or city office, or Congress, without coming into contact with disreputable persons, and occasionally finding themselves in situations capable of being misrepresented. They may have walked warily, they may not have swerved from the path of rectitude, but they must have been tempted to do so, and it requires no great invention to add details which give a bad look to the facts. As some men of note, from whom better

hings had been expected, have lapsed, a lapse by a man of tanding seems credible. It is therefore an easy task for the nscrupulous passions which a contest rouses to gather up umours, piece out old though unproved stories of corruption, ut the worst meaning on doubtful words, and so construct a lamning impeachment, which will be read in party journals y many voters who never see the defence. The worst of this abit of universal invective is that the plain citizen, hearing nuch which he cannot believe, finding foul imputations brought ven against those he has cause to respect, despairs of sifting he evidence, and sets down most of the charges to malice and campaign methods," while concluding that the residue is about qually true of all politicians alike. The distinction between ood and bad men is for many voters practically effaced, and ou have the spectacle of half the honest men supporting for he headship of the nation a person whom the other half eclare to be a knave. Extravagant abuse produces a reaction, nd makes the honest supporters of a candidate defend even is questionable acts. And thus the confidence of the country n the honour of its public men is lowered.

Less frequent, but more offensive, are the charges made gainst the private life of a candidate, particularly in his elations with women. American opinion is highly sensitive n this subject. Nothing damages a man more than a reputa- ion for irregularity in these relations; nothing therefore pens a more promising field to slander, and to the coarse ulgarity which is scarcely less odious, even if less mendacious, han slander itself.

These are the chief heads of attack. But there is nothing n the life or habits of a candidate out of which materials or a reproach may not be drawn. Of one it is said that e is too fond of eating; of another, that though he rents pew in Dr. Y——'s church, he is more frequently seen in a Roman Catholic place of worship; of a third, that he deserted is wife twenty-five years ago; of a fourth, that he is an atheist. His private conversations are reported; and when he denies he report, third persons are dragged in to refute his version. Nor does criticism stop with the candidate himself. His lead- ng supporters are arraigned and dissected. A man's surround- ngs do no doubt throw some light upon him. If you are

shown into a library, you derive an impression from the books on the shelves and the pictures on the wall; much more then may you be influenced by the character, if conspicuously good or evil, of a man's personal friends and political associates. But such methods of judging must be applied cautiously. American electioneering carries them beyond reasonable limits.

I do not mean that elections always bring these personal issues prominently to the front. Sometimes, where the candidates excite no strong enthusiasm or repulsion, they remain in the background. Their intrusion into what ought to be a contest of principles is unavoidable when the personal qualities of a candidate may affect the welfare of the country. But it has the unfortunate result of tending to draw attention away from political discussions, and thereby lessening what may be called the educational value of the campaign. A general election in England seems better calculated to instruct the masses of the people in the principles as well as the practical issues of politics, than the longer and generally hotter presidential contest in America. The average intelligence of the voter (excluding the negroes) is higher in America than in Britain, and his familiarity not only with the passwords and catchwords of politics, but with the structure of his own government, is much greater. But in Britain the contest is primarily one of programmes and not of persons. The leaders on each side are freely criticised, and most people are largely influenced by their judgment of the prime minister, and of the person who will become prime minister if the existing ministry be dismissed. Still the men are almost always overshadowed by the principles which they respectively advocate, and as invective and panegyric have already been poured for years, there is little inducement to rake up or invent tales against them. Controversy turns on the needs of the country, and on the measures which each party puts forward; attacks on a ministry are levelled at their public acts instead of their private characters. Americans who watch general elections in England say that they find in the speeches of English candidates more appeal to reason and experience, more argument and less sentimental rhetoric, than in the discourses of their own campaign orators. To such a general judgment there are, of course, many exceptions. I have read American election speeches, such as those of Mr

Beecher, whose vigorous thinking was in the highest degree instructive as well as stimulative; and the speaking of English candidates is probably, regarded as mere speaking, less effective than that of the American stump.

An examination of the causes which explain this difference belongs to another part of this book. Here I will only remark that the absence from British elections of flags, uniforms, torches, brass bands, parades, and all the other appliances employed in America, for making the people "enthuse," leaves the field more free for rational discussion. Add to this that whereas the questions discussed on British platforms during the last fifty years have been mainly questions needing argument, such as that of the corn laws in the typical popular struggle which Cobden and Bright and Villiers led, the most exciting theme for an American speaker during a whole generation was one — the existence and extension of slavery — which specially called for emotional treatment. Such subjects as the regulation of the tariff, competing plans of liquor legislation, currency and labour questions, are so difficult to sift thoroughly before a popular audience that the orator has been tempted to evade them or to deal in sounding commonplaces. Latterly, however, the growing gravity of the problems which the customs tariff and the national currency present, has induced a noteworthy change; and although these complex economic topics are often handled with little knowledge and in a declamatory way, it is a real gain that the popular mind should be constantly directed to them.

If the presidential contest may seem to do less for the formation of political thought and diffusion of political knowledge than was to be expected from the immense efforts put forth and the intelligence of the voters addressed, it nevertheless rouses and stirs the public life of the country. One can hardly imagine what the atmosphere of American politics would be without this quadrennial storm sweeping through it to clear away stagnant vapours, and recall to every citizen the sense of his own responsibility for the present welfare and future greatness of his country. Nowhere does government by the people, through the people, for the people, take a more directly impressive and powerfully stimulative form than in the choice of a chief magistrate by thirteen millions of citizens voting on one day.

CHAPTER LXXIII

FURTHER OBSERVATIONS ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

SEVERAL questions may have occurred to the European reader who has followed the foregoing account of presidential nominations and elections.

The most obvious is — How comes it that a system of nomination by huge party assemblies has grown up so unlike anything which the free countries of Europe have seen?

The nominating convention is the natural and legitimate outgrowth of two features of the Constitution, the restricted functions of Congress and the absolute sovereignty of the people. It was soon perceived that under the rule of party, a party must be united on its candidate in order to have a prospect of success. There was therefore need for a method of selecting the candidate which the whole of a party would recognize as fair and entitled to respect. At first the representatives of the party in Congress assumed the right of nomination. But it was presently felt that they were not entitled to it, for they had not been chosen for any such purpose, and the President was not constitutionally responsible to them, but rather set up to check them. When the congressional caucus had been discredited, the State legislatures tried their hands at nominations; but acting irregularly, and with a primary regard to local sentiment, they failed to win obedience. It began to be seen that whom the people were to elect the people must also nominate. Thus presently the tumultuous assemblies of active politicians were developed into regular representative bodies, modelled after Congress, and giving to the party in each State exactly the same weight in nominating as the State possessed in voting. The elaborate nominating scheme of primaries and conventions which was being constructed for the purpose of city, State, and congressional elections, was applied to the election of the Presi-

dent, and the national convention was the result. We may call it an effort of nature to fill the void left in America by the absence of the European parliamentary or cabinet system, under which an executive is called into being out of the legislature by the majority of the legislature. In the European system no single act of nomination is necessary, because the leader of the majority comes gradually to the top in virtue of his own strength.[1] In America there must be a single and formal act: and this act must emanate from the people, since it is to them that the party leader, when he becomes chief magistrate, will be responsible. There is not quite so strong a reason for entrusting to the convention the function of declaring the aims and tenets of the party in its platform, for this might properly be done by a caucus of the legislature. But as the President is, through his veto power, an independent branch of the legislature, the moment of nominating him is apt for a declaration of the doctrines whereof the party makes him the standard-bearer.

What have been the effects upon the public life of the country of this practice of nomination by conventions? Out of several I select two. Politics have turned largely upon the claims of rival personalities. The victory of a party in a presidential election depends upon its being unanimous in its support of a particular candidate. It must therefore use every effort to find, not necessarily the best man, but the man who will best unite it. In the pursuit of him, it is distracted from its consideration of the questions on which it ought to appeal to the country, and may form its views on them hastily or loosely. The convention is the only body authorized to declare the tenets and practical programme of the party. But the duty of declaring them is commonly overshadowed by the other duty of choosing the candidate, which naturally excites warmer feelings in the hearts of actual or potential office-holders. Accordingly,

[1] The nearest parallel to the American nominating system is the selection of their leader by the Opposition in the House of Commons, of which there has been only one instance, the choice of Lord Hartington by the Liberal members of that House in 1875; and on that occasion the other candidates withdrew before a vote was needed. The selection of a prime minister is the act of the Crown. If he sits in the House of Commons, he naturally leads it; if in the other house, he chooses one of his colleagues to lead in the Commons. What the Americans call "House caucuses," *i.e.* meetings of a party in the larger house of the legislature, are not uncommon in England.

delegates are chosen by local conventions rather as the partisans of this or that aspirant than as persons of political ability or moral weight; and the function of formulating the views of the party may be left to, and ill discharged by, men of an inferior type.

A further result will have been foreseen by those who have realized what these conventions are like. They are monster meetings. Besides the nine hundred delegates, there are some ten to fourteen thousand spectators on the floor and in the galleries, while at Chicago in 1860, there were also thousands on the roof. It goes without saying that such a meeting is capable neither of discussing political questions and settling a political programme, nor of deliberately weighing the merits of rival aspirants for the nomination. Its platform must be presented to it cut and dry, and this is the work of a small committee. In choosing a candidate, it must follow a few leaders.[1] And what sort of leaders do conventions tend to produce? Two sorts — the intriguer and the declaimer. There is the man who manipulates delegates and devises skilful combinations. There is also the orator, whose physical gifts, courage, and readiness enable him to browbeat antagonists, overawe the chairman, and perhaps, if he be possessed of eloquence, carry the multitude away in a fit of enthusiasm. For men of wisdom and knowledge, not seconded by a commanding voice and presence, there is no demand, and little chance of usefulness, in these tempestuous halls.

Why, however, it may also be asked, should conventions be so pre-eminently tempestuous, considering that they are not casual concourses, but consist of persons duly elected, and are governed by a regular code of procedure? The reason may be found in the fact that in them are united the two conditions which generate excitement, viz., very large numbers, and important issues to be determined. In no other modern assemblies[2]

[1] Hamilton had acutely remarked in 1788 that the larger an assembly, the greater is the power of a few in it. See Vol. I. p. 195.

[2] In the ancient world the assemblies of great democratic cities like Athens or Syracuse presented both these conditions; they had large numbers present and almost unlimited powers. But they were at any rate permanent bodies accustomed to meet frequently, composed of men who knew one another, who respected certain leaders, and applauded the same orators. The American convention consists of men who come together once only in their lives, and then for a week or less.

do these conditions concur. Modern deliberative assemblies are comparatively small — the House of Representatives has only 356 members; the French Chamber 584; while in the British House of Commons there is sitting space for only 400. Large popular gatherings, on the other hand, such as mass meetings, are excitable in virtue of their size, but have nothing to do but pass resolutions, and there is seldom controversy over these, because such meetings are attended only by those who agree with the summoners. But a national convention consists of more than eight hundred delegates, as many alternates, and some twelve thousand spectators. It is the hugest mass meeting the world knows of. Not only, therefore, does the sympathy of numbers exert an unequalled force, but this host, larger than the army with which the Greeks conquered at Marathon, has an issue of the highest and most exciting nature to decide, an issue which quickens the pulse even of those who read in cold blood afterwards how the votes fell as the roll of States was called, and which thrills those who see and listen, and, most of all, those who are themselves concerned as delegates, with an intensity of emotion surpassing, in proportion to the magnitude of the issue, that which attends the finish of a well-contested boat race. If you wish to realize the passionate eagerness of an American convention, take the House of Commons or the French Chamber during a division which is to decide the fate of a ministry and a policy, and raising the numbers present twenty-fold, imagine the excitement twenty-fold hotter. Wanting those wonderful scenes which a great debate and division in Parliament provide the English with, America has evolved others not less dramatic. The contrast between the two countries is perhaps most marked in this, that in Parliament the strife is between two parties, in an American convention between the adherents of different leaders belonging to the same party. We might have expected that in the more democratic country more would turn upon principles, less upon men. It is exactly the other way. The struggle in a convention is over men, not over principles.

These considerations may serve to explain to a European the strange phenomena of a convention. But his inquiry probably extends itself to the electoral campaign which follows. "Why," he asks, "is the contest so much longer, more strenuous, and more absorbing than the congressional elections, or than any

election struggle in Europe, although Europe is agitated by graver problems than now occupy America? And why does a people externally so cool, self-contained, and unimpulsive as the American work itself up into a fever of enthusiasm over an issue of little permanent importance between two men, neither of whom will do much good or can do much harm?"

The length of the contest is a survival. The Americans themselves regret it, for it sadly interrupts both business and pleasure. It is due to the fact that when communication was difficult over a rough and thinly settled country, several months were needed to enable the candidates and their orators to go round. Now railways and telegraphs have drawn the continent so much together that five or six weeks would be sufficient. That the presidential election is fought more vehemently than congressional elections seems due to its coming only half as often; to the fact that the President is the dispenser of Federal patronage, and to the habit formed in days when the President was the real head of the party, and his action in foreign affairs was important, of looking on his election as the great trial of party strength. Besides, it is the choice of one officer by the whole country, a supreme political act in which every voter has a share, and the same share; an act which fills the whole of the party in all of the States with the sense that it is feeling and thinking and willing as one heart and mind. This simultaneity of effort, this concentration of interest upon one person and one polling day, gives to the struggle a sort of tension not to be looked for where a number of elections of different persons are going on in as many different spots, nor always at the same time. In congressional elections each constituency has to think first of itself and its own candidate. In the presidential elections all eyes are fixed on the same figure; the same personal as well as political issue is presented to the nation. Each polling district in a State, each State in the Union, emulates every other in the efforts it puts forth to carry the party ticket.

To explain why the hard-headed self-possessed Americans go so wild with excitement at election times is a more difficult task. See what the facts are: There has not been a single presidential candidate, since Abraham Lincoln's re-election in 1864 (always excepting General Grant), of whom his friends

ould say that he had done anything to command the gratitude f the nation. Some of these candidates had been skilful party eaders, others had served with credit in the Civil War. None ould be called distinguished in the sense in which, I will not ay, Hamilton, Jefferson, Marshall, Webster, but J. Q. Adams, lay, Benton, Calhoun, Seward, Stanton, and Chase, were dis nguished men. However, let us take Mr. Blaine and Mr. leveland in the election of 1884. One had been Speaker of ne House, and was unquestionably a skilful debater in Con ress, an effective speaker on a platform, a man socially tractive, never forgetting a face or a service. The other ad made a shrewd, upright and courageous Mayor of Buffalo nd Governor of New York State. Compare the services ren ered to the country by them, or by any other candidate of ecent times, with those of Mazzini, Garibaldi, Cavour, and ictor Emmanuel to Italy, of Bismarck and Moltke to Ger any, even of Thiers and Gambetta to France in her hour of eril. Yet the enthusiasm shown for Mr. Blaine (who seems have drawn out the precious fluid at a higher temperature an his rival), the demonstrations made in his honour wher ver he appeared, equalled anything done, in their several ountries, for these heroes of Italy, Germany, or France. As r England, where two great political leaders, towering far bove their fellows, excited during many years the warmest dmiration and the bitterest dislike from friends and foes, nagine eight hundred English barristers turning out from e Temple and Lincoln's Inn to walk in slow procession from ondon Bridge to South Kensington, shouting themselves arse for Gladstone or Disraeli!

In attempting an explanation, I will take the bull by the rns, and ask whether the world is right in deeming the mericans a cool and sober people? The American is shrewd d keen, his passion seldom obscures his reason; he keeps his ad in moments when a Frenchman, or an Italian, or even a erman, would lose it. Yet he is also of an excitable temper, th emotions capable of being quickly and strongly stirred. hat there is no contradiction between these qualities appears om the case of the Scotch, who are both more logical and ore cautious in affairs than the English, but are also more thusiastic, more apt to be swept away by a passionate move-

ment.[1] Moreover, the Americans like excitement. They like i for its own sake, and go wherever they can find it. They sur render themselves to the enjoyment of this pleasure the mor willingly because it is comparatively rare, and relieves the leve tenor of their ordinary life. Add to this the further deligh which they find in any form of competition. The passion whic in England expresses itself in the popular eagerness over a boa race or a horse race, extends more widely in America to every kind of rivalry and struggle. The presidential election, in whic two men are pitted against one another over a four months course for the great prize of politics, stirs them like any othe trial of strength and speed; sets them betting on the issue disposes them to make efforts for a cause in which their deepe feelings may be little engaged.

These tendencies are intensified by the vast area over whic the contest extends, and the enormous multitude that bears part in it. The American imagination is peculiarly sensitive t the impression of great size. "A big thing" is their habitua phrase of admiration. In Europe, antiquity is what chiefly com mands the respect of some minds, novelty what rouses the in terest of others. Beyond the Atlantic, the sense of immensity the sense that the same thought and purpose are animatin millions of other men in sympathy with himself, lifts a ma out of himself, and sends him into transports of eagerness an zeal about things intrinsically small, but great through th volume of human feeling they have attracted. It is not th profundity of an idea or emotion, but its lateral extensio which most quickly touches the American imagination. Fo one man who can feel the former, a hundred are struck by th latter; and he who describes America must remember that h has always to think first of the masses.

These considerations may help to explain the disproportio that strikes a European between the merits of the presidenti candidate and the blazing enthusiasm which he evokes. It not really given to him as an individual, it is given to the part personified in him, because he bears its banner, and its fervou

[1] Sir Walter Scott remarks of Edinburgh early in the eighteenth centur that its mob was one of the fiercest in Europe. The history of the Covena from 1638 downwards is full of episodes which indicate how much mo excitable is Scotch than English blood.

due, not even so much to party passion as to the impres-
onist character of the people, who desire to be excited, desire
demonstrate, desire, as English undergraduates say, "to run
ith the boats," and cheer the efforts of the rowers. As regards
e details of the demonstrations, the parades and receptions,
e badges and brass bands and triumphal arches, any one can
derstand why the masses of the people — those who in Europe
ould be called the lower middle and working classes — should
lish these things, which break the monotony of their lives,
d give them a sense of personal participation in a great
ovement. Even in London, least externally picturesque
nong European cities, when the working men turn out for
Hyde Park meeting they come marshalled in companies
der the banners of their trade unions or other societies,
rrying devices, and preceded by music. They make a some-
nat scrubby show, for England does not know how to light
the dulness of her skies and streets by colour in costume
variety in design. But the taste for display is there as it is
human nature everywhere. In England, the upper class is
y of joining in any such "functions," even when they have
eligious tinge. Its fastidiousness and sense of class dignity
e offended. But in America, the sentiment of equality is so
rvading that the rich and cultivated do not think of scorn-
g the popular procession; or if some do feel such scorn, they
e careful to conceal it. The habit of demonstrating with
nds and banners and emblems was formed in days when the
per class was very small, and would not have dreamt of
anding aloof from anything which interested the crowd;
d now, when the rich and cultivated have grown to be as
merous, and, in most respects, as fastidious as the parallel
ss in Europe, the habit is too deeply rooted to be shaken.
body thinks of sneering. To do as the people do is a tribute
the people's majesty. And the thousand lawyers who
out "James G. Blaine, O-h-i-o," as they march through the
tober mud of Broadway, have no more sense that they
e making themselves ridiculous than the European noble
o backs with repeated obeisances out of the presence of
sovereign.

CHAPTER LXXIV

TYPES OF AMERICAN STATESMEN

As trees are known by their fruits, and as different systen of government evidently tend to produce different types statesmanship, it is pertinent to our examination of the Amer can party system to inquire what are the kinds of statesme which it engenders and ripens to maturity. A democrac more perhaps than any other form of government, needs gre men to lead and inspire the people. The excellence, therefor of the methods democracy employs may fairly enough be teste by the excellence of the statesmen whom these methods ca forth. Europeans are wont to go farther, and reason from t character of the statesmen to the character of the people, convenient process, because it seems easier to know the caree and judge the merits of persons than of nations, yet one n universally applicable. In the free countries of Europe, t men who take the lead in public affairs may be deemed fa specimens of its best talent and character, and fair types, p sibly of the virtues of the nation, though the temptations politics are great, certainly of its practical gifts. But in t sorts of countries one cannot so reason from the statesmen the masses. In despotic monarchies the minister is oft merely the king's favourite, who has risen by unworthy ar or, at any rate, not by merit. And in a democracy where bir and education give a man little advantage in the race, a poli cal career may have become so unattractive as compared wi other pursuits that the finest or most ambitious spirits do r strive for its prizes, but generally leave them to men of t second order.

This second case is, as we have seen, to some extent the case America. We must not therefore take her statesmen as typ of the highest or strongest American manhood. The natio

alities come out fully in them, but not always in their best
m. I speak of the generations that have grown up since the
eat men of the Revolution epoch died off. Some of those
n were the peers of the best European statesmen of the time:
e of them rises in moral dignity above all his European con-
nporaries. The generation to which J. Q. Adams, Jackson,
ebster, Clay, Calhoun, and Benton belonged is less impres-
e, perhaps because they failed to solve a question which
y have been too hard for any one to solve. Yet the men I
ve mentioned were striking personalities who would have
de a figure in any country. Few of the statesmen of the
rd or Civil War period enjoyed more than a local reputation
en it began, but in its course several of them developed re-
rkable powers, and one became a national hero. The fourth
neration is now upon the stage. The Americans confess that
t many who belong to it have as yet won fame. The times,
ey remark, are comparatively quiet. What is wanted is not
much an impassioned popular leader or a great philosophic
islator as men who will administer the affairs of the nation
th skill and rectitude, and who, fortified by careful study
d observation, will grapple with the economic problems
ich the growth of the country makes urgent. I admit this,
t think that much must also be ascribed to the character of
e party system which, as we have seen, is unfavourable to
e development of the finest gifts. Let us note what are the
es which that system displays to us.

In such countries as England, France, Germany, and Italy
ere is room and need for five sorts of statesmen. Men are
nted for the management of foreign and colonial policy, men
mbining the talents of a diplomatist with a wide outlook over
e world's horizon. The needs of social and economic reform,
ve in old countries with the mistakes of the past to undo,
quire a second kind of statesman with an aptitude for con-
uctive legislation. Thirdly there is the administrator who
n manage a department with diligence and skill and economy.
urthly comes the parliamentary tactician, whose function it
to understand men, who frames cabinets and is dexterous in
mouring or spurring a representative assembly.[1] Lastly we

[1] Englishmen will think of the men who framed the new Poor Law as
cimens of the second class, of Sir G. C. Lewis as a specimen of the third, of

have the leader of the masses, who, whether or no he be a skilful parliamentarian, thinks rather of the country than of the chamber, knows how to watch and rouse the feelings of the multitude, and rally a great party to the standard which he bears aloft. The first of these has no need for eloquence; the second and third can get on without it: to the fourth it is almost, yet not absolutely, essential; it is the life breath of the fifth.[1]

Let us turn to America. In America there are few occasions for the first sort of statesman, while the conditions of a Federal government, with its limited legislative sphere, are unfavourable to the second, as frequently changing cabinets are to the third. It is chiefly for persons of the fourth and fifth classes we must look. Persons of those classes we shall find, but in a different shape and guise from what they would assume in Europe. American politics seem at this moment to tend to the production of two types, the one of whom may be called *par excellence* the man of the desk or of the legislature, the other the man of the convention and the stump. They resemble the fourth and fifth of our European types, but with instructive differences.

The first of these types is usually a shrewd, cool, hard-headed man of business. He is such a man as one would find successful in the law or in commerce if he had applied his faculties to those vocations. He has mostly been, is often still, a practising counsel and attorney. He may lack imagination and width of view; but he has a tight grip of facts, a keen insight into men, and probably also tact in dealing with them. That he has come to the front shows him to possess a resolute and tenacious will, for without it he must have been trodden down in the fierce competition of a political career. His independence is limited by the necessity of keeping step with his party, for isolated action counts for little in America, but the tendency to go with one's party is so inbred there that a man feels less humiliated by waiving his private views than would be the case in Europe. Such compliance does not argue want of strength. As to what is called "culture," he has often at least a suscep-

Lord Palmerston as a specimen of the fourth. The aptitudes of the third and fourth were united in Sir Robert Peel.

[1] It need hardly be said that the characteristic attributes of these several types are often found united in the same person; indeed no one can rise high who does not combine at least two of the four latter.

ility to it, with a wish to acquire it which, if he has risen from umble beginnings, may contrast oddly with the superficial oughness of his manner. He is a ready and effective rather han a polished speaker, and is least agreeable when, forsaking he solid ground of his legal or administrative knowledge, he ttempts the higher flights of eloquence.

Such a man does not necessarily make his first reputation in n assembly. He may begin as governor of a State or mayor f a large city, and if he earns a reputation there, can make retty sure of going on to Congress if he desires it. In any ase, it is in administration and the legislative work which eals with administration that he wins his spurs. The sphere f local government is especially fitted to develop such talents, nd to form that peculiar quality I have been trying to describe. makes able men of affairs; men fit for the kind of work hich needs the combination of a sound business head and the ower of working along with others. One may go further and y, that this talent is the sort of talent which during the last alf-century has been most characteristic of the American eople. Their greatest achievements have lain in the internal evelopment of their country by administrative shrewdness, genuity, promptitude, and an unequalled dexterity in applying e principle of association, whether by means of private cor- rations or of local public or quasi-public organisms. These ational characteristics reappear in Federal politics, not always companied by the largeness of vision and mastery of the politi- l and economic sciences which that wider sphere demands.

The type I describe is less brilliant than those modern urope has learned to admire in men like Bismarck or Cavour, rhaps one may add, Tisza or Minghetti or Castelar. But en the conditions required for the rise of the last-named en do not exist in America, nor is her need for them pressing. nerica would have all she wants if such statesmen as I have scribed were more numerous; and if a philosophic mind, pable of taking in the whole phenomena of transatlantic ciety, and propounding comprehensive solutions for its prob- ns, were more common among the best of them. Persons of is type have hitherto been most frequently found in the nate, to which they usually rise from the House of Repre- ntatives or from a State legislature. They are very useful

there; indeed, it is they who gained for it that authority which it long enjoyed but is now fast losing.

The other kind of statesman is the product of two factors which give to American politics their peculiar character, viz., an enormous multitude of voting citizens, and the existence of a wonderful network of party organizations for the purpose of selecting and carrying candidates for office. To move the masses, a man must have the gifts of oratory; to rule party committees, he must be a master of intrigue. The stump and the committee-room are his sphere. There is a great deal of campaign speaking to be done at State elections, at congressional elections, above all, in presidential campaigns. It does not flow in such a perennial torrent as in England, for England has since 1876 become the most speech-flooded country in the world, but it is more copious than in France, Italy, or Germany. The audiences are less ignorant than those of Europe, but their critical standard is not higher; and whereas in England it is Parliament that forms most speakers and creates the type of political oratory, Congress renders no such service to America. There is, therefore, I think, less presumption in America than in Europe that the politician who makes his way by oratory is a man either of real eloquence or of vigorous thinking power. Able, however, he must be. He is sure to have fluency, a power of touching either the emotions or the imagination, a command of sonorous rhetoric. Probably he has also humour and a turn for quick retort. In fact, he must have the arts — we all know what they are — which please the multitude; arts not blamable in themselves, but needing to be corrected by occasional appearances before a critical audience. These arts joined to a powerful voice and a forcible personality will carry a man far. If he can join to them a ready and winning address, a geniality of manner if not of heart, he becomes what is called magnetic. Now, magnetism is among the highest qualities which an American popular leader can possess. Its presence may bring him to the top. Its absence may prevent him from getting there. It makes friends for him wherever he goes. It immensely enhances his powers in the region of backstairs politics.

For besides the visible work on the stump, there is the invisible work of the committee-room, or rather of the inner conclave, whose resolves are afterwards registered in the committee

be still later laid before the convention. The same talent for ntrigue which in monarchies or oligarchies is spent within the mits of a court or a knot of ruling families, here occupies itself ith bosses and rings and leaders of political groups. To ma-ipulate these men and groups, to know their weaknesses, their nbitions, their jealousies, to play upon their hopes and fears, ttaching some by promises, entrapping others through their anity, browbeating others into submission, forming combina-ons in which each partisan's interest is so bound up with that the aspiring statesman that he is sure to stand faithfully by s chief — all this goes a long way to secure advancement nder the party system.

It may be thought that between such aptitudes and the ower of effective speech there is no necessary connection. here are intriguers who are nothing but intriguers, of small ccount on the stump or on the platform of a convention: and ch a man does occasionally rise to national prominence. irst he gains command of his own State by a dexterous use patronage; then he wins influence in Federal politics by eing able to dispose of his State vote in Federal elections; nally he forces his way into the Senate, and possibly even spires to the presidential chair, deluded by his own advance-ent, and by the applause of professionals who find in success fficient evidence of worthiness. Recent instances of such reers are not wanting. But they are exceptions due to the ecial conditions of exceptionally demoralized States. Speak-g generally, oratory is essential to distinction. Fluent ora-ry, however, as distinguished from eloquence, is an art which ost able men can acquire with practice. In popularly gov-ned countries it is as common as it is worthless. And a nk between the platform and the committee-room is found in e quality of magnetism. The magnetic man attracts indi-duals just as he captivates masses. Where oratory does not ed either knowledge or reflection, because the people are t intent upon great questions, or because the parties evade em, where power of voice and skill in words, and ready mpathy with the feelings and prejudices of the crowd, are ough to command the ear of monster meetings, there the ccessful speaker will pass for a statesman. He will seem a man to put forward for high office, if he can but persuade

the managers to run him; and therefore the other side of his activity is spent among and upon the managers.

It sometimes happens that the owner of these gifts is also a shrewd, keen, practical man, so that the first type is blended with the second. Nor is there anything to prevent the popular speaker and skilled intriguer from also possessing the higher attributes of statesmanship. This generation has seen the conjunction both in America and in France. But the conjunction is rare; not only because these last-named attributes are themselves rare, but because the practice of party intrigue is unfavourable to their development. It narrows a man's mind and distorts his vision. His eye, accustomed to the obscurity of committee-rooms, cannot range over the wide landscape of national questions. Habits of argument formed on the stump seldom fit a man to guide a legislature. In none of the greatest public men that have adorned America do we discern the features of the type just sketched. Hamilton was no intriguer though he once executed a brilliant piece of strategy.[1] Neither was Clay or Webster. Jefferson, who added an eminent talent for party organization and management to his powers as a thinker and writer, was no speaker; and one might go through the whole list without finding a man of the first order in whom the art of handling committees and nominating conventions was developed to that pitch of excellence which it has now reached in the hands of far inferior men. National conventions offer the best field for the display of the peculiar kind of talent which this type of statesman exhibits. To rouse eight hundred delegates and ten thousand spectators needs powerful lungs, a striking presence, address, and courage. A man capable enough in Congress may fail in this arena. But less than half the work of a convention is done on the public stage. Delegates have to be seen in private, combinations arranged, mines laid and those of the opponent discovered and countermined, a distribution of the good things in the gift of the party settled with swarms of hungry aspirants. Easy manners, tact, and suppleness, a reputation for remembering and requiting good turns and ill turns — in fact, many of the qualities which make

[1] In agreeing that the national capital should be placed in the South in return for the support of two Southern men to his plan for the settlement of the public debt.

ourtier — are the qualities which the intrigues of a convention equire, develop, and perfect.

Besides such causes inherent in the present party system as heck the growth of first-class statesmen in America, there are wo springing from her constitutional arrangements which must ot be forgotten. One is the disconnection of Congress from he executive. How this works to prevent true leadership has een already explained.[1] Another is the existence of States, ach of which has a political life and distinct party organization f its own. Men often rise to eminence in a State without aking their mark in national politics. They may become irtual masters of the State either in a legitimate way by good ervice to it or in an illegitimate way as its bosses. In either ase they have to be reckoned with when a presidential election omes round, and are able, if the State be a doubtful one, to ictate their terms. Thus they push their way to the front ithout having ever shown the qualities needed for guiding he nation; they crowd out better men, and they make party adership and management even more of a game than the oils system and the convention system have tended to make . The State vote comes to be in national politics what he ward vote is in city politics, a commodity which a boss or ng can dispose of; the power of a man who can influence it greater than his personal merits entitle him to; and the nd of skill which can make friends of these State bosses and ing them into a "pool" or working combination becomes luable, if not essential, to a national party leader. In fact, he condition of things is not wholly unlike that of England the middle of last century, when a great borough-monger ke the Duke of Newcastle was a power in the country, who ust be not only consulted and propitiated at every crisis, but en admitted to a ministry if it was to secure a parliamentary ajority. When a crisis rouses the nation, the power of these ganization-mongers or vote-owners vanishes, just as that of e English borough-owning magnate was checked on like casions, because it is only when the people of a State are stless that their Boss is potent. Unable to oppose a real ish of the masses, he can use their vote only by professing

[1] See Chapters XXI., XXV., and XXVI. in Vol. I.

obedience while guiding it in the direction of the men or the schemes he favours.

This remark suggests another. We have noted that among statesmen of the former of the two types described, there always exist ability and integrity sufficient for carrying on the regular business of the country. Men with those still higher gifts which European nations look for in their prime ministers (though they do not always find them) have of late years been rare. The Americans admit the fact, but explain it by arguing that there has been no crisis needing those gifts. Whether this is true may be doubted. Men of constructive statesmanship were surely needed in the period after the Civil War: and it is possible that a higher statesmanship might have averted the war itself. The Americans, however, maintain that when the hour comes, it brings the man. It brought Abraham Lincoln. When he was nominated by the famous convention of 1860, his name was not widely known beyond his own State. But he rose at once to the level of the situation and that not merely by virtue of strong clear sense, but by his patriotic steadfastness and noble simplicity of character. If this was luck, it was just the kind of luck which makes a nation hopeful of its future, and inclined to overlook the faults of the methods by which it finds its leaders.

CHAPTER LXXV

WHAT THE PEOPLE THINK OF IT

The European reader who has followed thus far the description I have endeavoured to give of the working of party politics, of the nominating machine, of the spoils system, of elections and their methods, of venality in some legislative and municipal bodies, may have been struck by its dark lines. He sees in this new country evils which savour of Old World corruption, even of Old World despotism. He is reminded sometimes of England under Sir Robert Walpole, sometimes of Russia under the Czar Nicholas. Assuming, as a European is apt to do, that the working of political machinery fairly reflects the temper, ideas, and moral standard of the governing class, and knowing that America is governed by the whole people, he may form a low opinion of the people. Perhaps he leaps to the conclusion that they are corrupt. Perhaps he more cautiously infers that they are heedless. Perhaps he conceives that the better men despair of politics and wash their hands of it, while the mass, besotted with a self-confidence born of their rapid material progress, are blind to the consequences which the degradation of public life must involve. All these judgments one may hear pronounced by persons who have visited America, and of course more confidently by persons who have not. It is at any rate a plausible view that whatever public opinion there may be in America upon religion, or morality, or literature, there can be little about politics, and that the leading minds, which in all countries shape and direct opinion, have in America abdicated that function, and left the politicians to go their own way.

Such impressions are far from the truth. In no country is public opinion stronger or more active than in the United States; in none has it the field so completely to itself, be-

cause aristocracies like those of Europe do not exist, an because the legislative bodies are relatively less powerf and less independent. It may seem a paradox to add th public opinion is on the whole wholesome and upright. Neve theless, this also is true.

Here we are brought face to face with the cardinal proble of American politics. Where political life is all-pervadin can practical politics be on a lower level than public opinion How can a free people which tolerates gross evils be a pu people? To explain this is the hardest task which one wh describes the United States sees confronting him. Experien has taught me, as it teaches every traveller who seeks justify when he returns to Europe his faith in the America people, that it is impossible to get Englishmen at any rate realize the coexistence of phenomena so unlike those of the own country, and to draw the inferences which those phenom ena suggest to one who has seen them with his own eye Most English admirers of popular government, when presse with the facts, deny them. But I have already admitted ther

To present a just picture of American public opinion o must cut deeper than the last few chapters have done, and t to explain the character and conditions of opinion itself beyo the Atlantic, the mental habits from which it springs, th organs through which it speaks. This is what I propose to d in the chapters which follow. Meanwhile it is well to co plete the survey of the actualities of party politics by stati in a purely positive, or, as the Germans say, "objective," wa what the Americans think about the various features of the system portrayed in these last chapters, about Spoils and th Machine, about corruption and election frauds. I omit attemp at explanation; I simply sum up the bare facts of the case they strike one who listens to conversation and reads th newspapers.

Corruption. — Most of it the people, by which I mean n the masses but all classes of the people, do not see. The pr ceedings of Congress excite less interest than those of legis tive chambers do in France or England. Venality occu chiefly in connection with private legislation, and even Washington very little is known about this, the rather as co mittees deliberate with closed doors. Almost the only perso

ho possess authentic information as to what goes on in the apitol are railroad men, land speculators, and manufacturers ho have had to lobby in connection with the tariff. The me remark applies, though less forcibly, to the venality of rtain State legislatures. A farmer of Western New York ay go through a long life without knowing how his rep- sentative behaves at Albany. Albany is not within his rizon.[1]

The people see little and they believe less. True, the party wspapers accuse their opponents, but the newspapers are ways reviling somebody; and it is because the words are so rong that the tale has little meaning. For instance, in a cent presidential contest charges affecting the honour of one the candidates were brought against him by journals sup- rting the other candidate, and evidence tendered in support them. The immense majority of his supporters did not lieve these charges. They read their own newspapers chiefly, hich pooh-poohed the charges. They could not be at the ouble of sifting the evidence, against which their own news- pers offered counter arguments, so they quietly ignored em. I do not say that they disbelieved. Between belief d disbelief there is an intermediate state of mind.

The habit of hearing charges promiscuously bandied to and , but seldom probed to the bottom, makes men heedless. does the fact that prosecutions frequently break down even here there can be little doubt as to the guilt of the accused. general impression is produced that things are not as they ould be, yet the line between honest men and dishonest men not sharply drawn, because those who are probably honest e attacked, and those who are almost certainly dishonest cape punishment. The state of mind of the average citizen a state rather of lassitude than of callousness. He comes think that politicians have a morality of their own, and ust be judged by it. It is not his morality; but because it professional, he does not fear that it will infect other plain izens like himself.

Some people shrug their shoulders and say that politicians ve always been so. Others, especially among the cultivated

[1] This remark does not apply to the malversations of officials in cities like v York or Philadelphia. These nobody can help knowing.

classes, will tell you that they wash their hands of the wh affair. "It is only the politicians — what can you exp from the politicians?" But there are also many who a shocked, and who, as already observed, exert themsel through the press, and by agitating where they see an opp tunity of catching the public ear, to purify polities. Leavi out the cynics on the one side, and the perfectionist reforme on the other, and looking at the bulk of ordinary citizens, t fair conclusion from the facts is that many do not realize t evil who ought to realize it and be alarmed, and that th who do realize it are not sufficiently alarmed. They take it t easily. Yet now and then when roused they will inflict seve penalties on the givers and receivers of bribes, as they late did on the New York aldermen who were bribed to grant t right of laying a horse-car line in Broadway.

Election Frauds. — As these are offences against popular g ernment and injure the opposite party, they excite strong or at least more general disapproval than do acts of venali from which only the public purse suffers. No one attempts palliate them; but proof is difficult, and punishment theref uncertain. Legislative remedies have been tried, and fr ones are constantly being tried. If people are less indigna than they would be in England, it is because they are less s prised. There is one exception to the general condemnation the practice. In the Southern States negro suffrage produc during the few years of "carpet-bagging" and military gove ment which followed the war, incredible mischief. When th States recovered full self-government, and the former "rebe were readmitted to the suffrage, the upper class of the wh population "took hold" again, and in order, as they expres it, "to save civilization," resolved that come what might, negro and white Republican vote should not, by obtainin majority in the State legislatures, be in a position to play th pranks further. The negroes were at first roughly handled to use the technical term, "bull-dozed," but as this exci anger at the North, it was found better to attain the desi result by manipulating the elections in various ways, "us no more fraud than was necessary in the premises," as pleaders say. As the negroes are obviously unfit for the s frage, these services to civilization have been leniently regar

en at the North, and are justified at the South by men quite ove the suspicion of personal corruption.

The Machine. — The perversion by Rings and Bosses of the minating machinery of primaries and conventions excites a gust whose strength is proportioned to the amount of ud and trickery employed, an amount not great when the ood citizens" make no counter exertions. The disgust is s than a European expects, for it is mingled with amuse- nt. The Boss is a sort of joke, albeit an expensive joke. fter all," people say, "it is our own fault. If we all went the primaries, or if we all voted an Independent ticket, we ld make an end of the Boss." There is a sort of fatalism heir view of democracy. If a thing exists in a free country, as a right to exist, for it exists by the leave of the people, o may be deemed to acquiesce in what they do not extin- sh.

The Spoils System. — As to spoils and favouritism in pat- age, I have already explained why the average citizen toler- s both. He has been accustomed to think rotation in office ecognition of equality, and a check on the growth of that bugbear, an "aristocracy of office-holders." He does not how favouritism can be prevented, for competitive examina- ns have seemed pedantic. Usage has sanctioned a certain ount of jobbery, so you must not be too hard on a man who s no more than others have done before him.

The conduct, as well as the sentiment, of the people is so h better than the practice of politicians that it is hard to erstand why the latter are judged so leniently. No ordi- y citizen, much less a man of social standing and high educa- , would do in his private dealings what many politicians do h little fear of disgrace. The career of the latter is not troyed, while the former would lose the respect of his neigh- rs, and probably his chances in the world. Europe presents similar contrast between the tone of public and that of pri- e life.

There is, however, one respect in which a comparison of the tical morality of the United States with that of England s injustice to the former.

he English have two moralities for public life, the one con- tional or ideal, the other actual. The conventional finds

expression not merely in the pulpit, but also in the speeches of public men, in the articles of journalists. Assuming the normal British statesman to be patriotic, disinterested, truthful, and magnanimous, it treats every fault as a dereliction from a well-settled standard of duty, a quite exceptional dereliction which disentitles the culprit to the confidence even of his own party, but does not affect the generally high tone of British political life. The actual morality, as one gathers it in the lobbies of the legislative chambers, or the smoking-rooms of political clubs, or committee-rooms at contested elections, is a different affair. It regards (or lately regarded) the bribery of voters as an offence only when detection followed; it assumes that a minister will use his patronage to strengthen his party or himself; it smiles at election pledges as the gods smiled at lovers' vows; it defends the abuse of parliamentary rules; it tolerates equivocations and misleading statements proceeding from an official even when they have not the excuse of State necessity. It is by this actual standard that Englishmen do in fact judge one another; and he who does not sink below it need not fear the conventional ideality of press and pulpit.

Perhaps this is only an instance of the tendency in all professions to develop a special code of rules less exacting than those of the community at large. As a profession holds some things to be wrong, because contrary to its etiquette, which are in themselves harmless, so it justifies other things in themselves blamable. In the mercantile world, agents play sad tricks on their principals in the matter of commissions, and their fellow-merchants are astonished when the courts of law compel the ill-gotten gains to be disgorged. At the University of Oxford, everybody who took a Master of Arts degree was, until 1871, required to sign the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. Hundreds of men signed who did not believe, and admitted that they did not believe, the dogmas of this formulary; but nobody thought the worse of them for a solemn falsehood. We know what latitude, as regards truth, a "scientific witness," honourable enough in his private life, permits himself in the witness box. Each profession indulges in deviations from the established rule of morals, but takes pains to conceal these deviations from the general public, and continues to talk about itself and its traditions with an air of

unsullied virtue. What each profession does for itself most individual men do for themselves. They judge themselves by themselves, that is to say, by their surroundings and their own past acts, and thus erect in the inner forum of conscience a more lenient code for their own transgressions than that which they apply to others. A fault which a man has often committed seems to him slighter than one he has refrained from and sees others committing. Often he gets others to take the same view. "It is only his way," they say; "it is just like Roger." The same thing happens with nations. The particular forms in which faults like corruption, or falsehood, or unscrupulous partisanship have appeared in the recent political history of a nation shock its moral sense less than similar offences which have taken a different form in some other country.

Now England, while accustomed to judge her own statesmen, as well as her national behaviour generally, by the actual standard, and therefore to overlook many deflections from the ideal, always applies the conventional or absolute standard to other countries, and particularly to America, which has been subjected to that censorious scrutiny which the children of an emigrant brother receive on their return from aunts and uncles.

How then does America deal with herself?

She is so far lenient to her own defects as to judge them by her past practice; that is to say, she is less shocked by certain political vices, because these vices are familiar, than might have been expected from the generally high tone of her people. But so far from covering things up as the English do, professing a high standard, and applying it rigorously to other countries, but leniently to her own offspring, she gives an exceptionally free course to publicity of all kinds, and allows writers and speakers to paint the faults of her politicians in strong, not to say exaggerated, colours. Such excessive candour is not an unmixed gain. It removes the restraint which the maintenance of a conventional standard imposes. There is almost too little of make-believe about Americans in public writing, as well as in private talk, and their dislike to humbug, hypocrisy, and what they call English pharisaism, not only tends to laxity, but has made them wrong in the eyes of the Old World their real moral sensitiveness. Accustomed to see

constant lip-service rendered to a virtue not intended to be practised, Europeans naturally assume that things are in the United States several shades darker than they are painted, and interpret frankness as cynicism. Were American politics judged by the actual and not the conventional standard of England, the contrast between the demerits of the politicians and the merits of the people would be less striking.

PART IV

PUBLIC OPINION

CHAPTER LXXVI

THE NATURE OF PUBLIC OPINION

In no country is public opinion so powerful as in the United States: in no country can it be so well studied. Before I proceed to describe how it works upon the government of the nation and the States, it may be proper to consider briefly how it is formed, and what is the nature of the influence which it everywhere exercises upon government.

What do we mean by public opinion? The difficulties which occur in discussing its action mostly arise from confounding opinion itself with the organs whence people try to gather it, and from using the term to denote, sometimes everybody's views, — that is, the aggregate of all that is thought and said on a subject, — sometimes merely the views of the majority, the particular type of thought and speech which prevails over other types.

The simplest form in which public opinion presents itself is when a sentiment spontaneously rises in the mind and flows from the lips of the average man upon his seeing or hearing something done or said. Homer presents this with his usual vivid directness in the line which frequently recurs in the Iliad when the effect produced by a speech or event is to be conveyed: "And thus any one was saying as he looked at his neighbour." This phrase describes what may be called the rudimentary stage of opinion. It is the prevalent impression of the moment. It is what any man (not every man) says, *i.e.* it is the natural and the general thought or wish which an occurrence evokes. But before opinion begins to tell upon government, it has to go through several other stages. These stages are various in different ages and countries. Let us try to note what they are in England or America at the present time, and how each stage grows out of the other.

A business man reads in his newspaper at breakfast the events of the preceding day. He reads that Prince Bismarck has announced a policy of protection for German industry, or that Mr. Henry George has been nominated for the mayoralty of New York. These statements arouse in his mind sentiments of approval or disapproval, which may be strong or weak according to his previous predilection for or against protection or Mr. Henry George, and of course according to his personal interest in the matter. They rouse also an expectation of certain consequences likely to follow. Neither the sentiment nor the expectation is based on processes of conscious reasoning — our business man has not time to reason at breakfast — they are merely impressions formed on the spur of the moment. He turns to the leading article in the newspaper, and his sentiments and expectations are confirmed or weakened according as he finds that they are or are not shared by the newspaper writer. He goes down to his office in the train, talks there to two or three acquaintances, and perceives that they agree or do not agree with his own still faint impressions. In his counting-house he finds his partner and a bundle of other newspapers which he glances at; their words further affect him, and thus by the afternoon his mind is beginning to settle down into a definite view, which approves or condemns Prince Bismarck's declaration or the nomination of Mr. George. Meanwhile a similar process has been going on in the minds of others, and particularly of the journalists, whose business it is to discover what people are thinking. The evening paper has collected the opinions of the morning papers, and is rather more positive in its forecast of results. Next day the leading journals have articles still more definite and positive in approval or condemnation and in prediction of consequences to follow; and the opinion of ordinary minds, hitherto fluid and undetermined, has begun to crystallize into a solid mass. This is the second stage. Then debate and controversy begin. The men and the newspapers who approve Mr. George's nomination argue with those who do not; they find out who are friends and who opponents. The effect of controversy is to drive the partisans on either side from some of their arguments, which are shown to be weak; to confirm them in others, which they think strong; and to make them take up

definite position on one side. This is the third stage. The fourth is reached when action becomes necessary. When a citizen has to give a vote, he votes as a member of a party; his party prepossessions and party allegiance lay hold on him, and generally stifle any doubts or repulsions he may feel. Bringing men up to the polls is like passing a steam roller over stones newly laid on a road: the angularities are pressed down, and an appearance of smooth and even uniformity is given which did not exist before. When a man has voted, he is committed: he has thereafter an interest in backing the view which he has sought to make prevail. Moreover, opinion, which may have been manifold till the polling, is thereafter generally twofold only. There is a view which has triumphed and a view which has been vanquished.

In examining the process by which opinion is formed, we cannot fail to note how small a part of the view which the average man entertains when he goes to vote is really of his own making. His original impression was faint and perhaps shapeless: its present definiteness and strength are mainly due to what he has heard and read. He has been told what to think, and why to think it. Arguments have been supplied to him from without, and controversy has imbedded them in his mind. Although he supposes his view to be his own, he holds it rather because his acquaintances, his newspapers, his party leaders all hold it. His acquaintances do the like. Each man believes and repeats certain phrases, because he thinks that everybody else on his own side believes them, and of what each believes only a small part is his own original impression, the far larger part being the result of the commingling and mutual action and reaction of the impressions of a multitude of individuals, in which the element of pure personal conviction, based on individual thinking, is but small.

Every one is of course predisposed to see things in some one particular light by his previous education, habits of mind, accepted dogmas, religious or social affinities, notions of his own personal interest. No event, no speech or article, ever falls upon a perfectly virgin soil: the reader or listener is always more or less biassed already. When some important event happens, which calls for the formation of a view, these pre-existing habits, dogmas, affinities, help to determine the

impression which each man experiences, and so far are factors in the view he forms. But they operate chiefly in determining the first impression, and they operate over many minds at once. They do not produce variety and independence: they are soon overlaid by the influences which each man derives from his fellows, from his leaders, from the press.

Orthodox democratic theory assumes that every citizen has, or ought to have, thought out for himself certain opinions, *i.e.* ought to have a definite view, defensible by arguments, of what the country needs, of what principles ought to be applied in governing it, of the men to whose hands the government ought to be entrusted. There are persons who talk, though certainly very few who act, as if they believed this theory, which may be compared to the theory of some ultra-Protestants that every good Christian has or ought to have, by the strength of his own reason, worked out for himself from the Bible a system of theology. But one need only try the experiment of talking to that representative of public opinion whom the Americans call "the man in the cars," to realize how uniform opinion is among all classes of people, how little there is in the ideas of each individual of that individuality which they would have if he had formed them for himself, how little solidity and substance there is in the political or social beliefs of nineteen persons out of every twenty. These beliefs, when examined, mostly resolve themselves into two or three prejudices and aversions, two or three prepossessions for a particular leader or party or section of a party, two or three phrases or catchwords suggesting or embodying arguments which the man who repeats them has not analyzed. It is not that these nineteen persons are incapable of appreciating good arguments, or are unwilling to receive them. On the contrary, and this is especially true of the working classes, an audience is pleased when solid arguments are addressed to it, and men read with most relish the articles or leaflets, supposing them to be smartly written, which contain the most carefully sifted facts and the most exact thought. But to the great mass of mankind in all places, public questions come in the third or fourth rank among the interests of life, and obtain less than a third or a fourth of the leisure available for thinking. It is therefore rather sentiment than thought that the mass can contribute, a sentiment grounded on a few

broad considerations and simple trains of reasoning; and the soundness and elevation of their sentiment will have more to do with their taking their stand on the side of justice, honour, and peace, than any reasoning they can apply to the sifting of the multifarious facts thrown before them, and to the drawing of the legitimate inferences therefrom.

It may be suggested that this analysis, if true of the uneducated, is not true of the educated classes. It is less true of that small class which in Europe specially occupies itself with politics; which, whether it reasons well or ill, does no doubt reason. But it is substantially no less applicable to the commercial and professional classes than to the working classes; for in the former, as well as in the latter, one finds few persons who take the pains, or have the leisure, or indeed possess the knowledge, to enable them to form an independent judgment. The chief difference between the so-called upper, or wealthier, and the humbler strata of society is, that the former are less influenced by sentiment and possibly more influenced by notions, often erroneous, of their own interest. Having something to lose, they imagine dangers to their property or their class ascendency. Moving in a more artificial society, their sympathies are less readily excited, and they more frequently indulge the tendency to cynicism natural to those who lead a life full of unreality and conventionalisms.

The apparent paradox that where the humbler classes have differed in opinion from the higher, they have often been proved by the event to have been right and their so-called betters wrong (a fact sufficiently illustrated by the experience of many European countries during the last half-century[1]), may perhaps be explained by considering that the historical and scientific data on which the solution of a difficult political problem depends are really just as little known to the wealthy as to the poor. Ordinary education, even the sort of education

[1] It may be said that this has been so because the movements of the last half-century have been mostly movements in a democratic direction, which obtained the sympathy of the humbler classes because tending to break down the power and privilege which the upper classes previously enjoyed. This observation, however, does not meet all the cases, among which may be mentioned the attitude of the English working classes towards Italy from 1848 onwards, as well as their attitude in the American Civil War from 1861 to 1865, and in the Eastern Question from 1876 onwards, for in none of these instances had they any personal interest.

which is represented by a university degree, does not fit a man to handle these questions, and it sometimes fills him with a vain conceit of his own competence which closes his mind to argument and to the accumulating evidence of facts. Education ought, no doubt, to enlighten a man; but the educated classes, speaking generally, are the property-holding classes, and the possession of property does more to make a man timid than education does to make him hopeful. He is apt to underrate the power as well as the worth of sentiment; he overvalues the restraints which existing institutions impose, he has a faint appreciation of the curative power of freedom, and of the tendency which brings things right when men have been left to their own devices, and have learnt from failure how to attain success. In the less-educated man a certain simplicity and openness of mind go some way to compensate for the lack of knowledge. He is more apt to be influenced by the authority of leaders; but as, at least in England and America, he is generally shrewd enough to discern between a great man and a demagogue, this is more a gain than a loss.

While suggesting these as explanations of the paradox, I admit that it remains a paradox. But the paradox is not in the statement, but in the facts. Nearly all great political and social causes have made their way first among the middle or humbler classes. The original impulse which has set the cause in motion, the inspiring ideas that have drawn men to it, have come from lofty and piercing minds, and minds generally belonging to the cultivated class. But the principles and precepts these minds have delivered have waxed strong because the common people received them gladly, while the wealthy and educated classes have frowned on or persecuted them. The most striking instance of all is to be found in the early history of Christianity.

The analysis, however, which I have sought to give of opinion applies only to the nineteen men out of twenty, and not to the twentieth. It applies to what may be called passive opinion — the opinion of those who have no special interest in politics, or concern with them beyond that of voting, of those who receive or propagate, but do not originate, views on public matters. Or, to put the same thing in different words, we have been considering how public opinion grows and spreads, as it

were, spontaneously and naturally. But opinion does not merely grow; it is also made. There is not merely the passive class of persons; there is the active class, who occupy themselves primarily with public affairs, who aspire to create and lead opinion. The processes which these guides follow are too well known to need description. There are, however, one or two points which must be noted, in order to appreciate the reflex action of the passive upon the active class.

The man who tries to lead public opinion, be he statesman, journalist, or lecturer, finds in himself, when he has to form a judgment upon any current event, a larger measure of individual prepossession, and of what may be called political theory and doctrine, than belongs to the average citizen. His view is therefore likely to have more individuality, as well as more intellectual value. On the other hand, he has also a stronger motive than the average citizen for keeping in agreement with his friends and his party, because if he stands aloof and advocates a view of his own, he may lose his influence and his position. He has a past, and is prevented, by the fear of seeming inconsistent, from departing from what he has previously said. He has a future, and dreads to injure it by severing himself ever so little from his party. He is accordingly driven to make the same sort of compromise between his individual tendencies and the general tendency which the average citizen makes. But he makes it more consciously, realizing far more distinctly the difference between what he would think, say, and do, if left to himself, and what he says and does as a politician, who can be useful and prosperous only as a member of a body of persons acting together and professing to think alike.

Accordingly, though the largest part of the work of forming opinion is done by these men, — whom I do not call professional politicians, because in Europe many of them are not solely occupied with politics, while in America the name of professionals must be reserved for another class, — we must not forget the reaction constantly exercised upon them by the passive majority. Sometimes a leading statesman or journalist takes a line to which he finds that the mass of those who usually agree with him are not responsive. He perceives that they will not follow him, and that he must choose between isolation and a modification of his own views. A statesman may sometimes venture

on the former course, and in very rare cases succeed in imposing his own will and judgment on his party. A journalist, however, is obliged to hark back if he has inadvertently taken up a position disagreeable to his *clientèle*, because the proprietors of the paper have their circulation to consider. To avoid so disagreeable a choice a statesman or a journalist is usually on the alert to sound the general opinion before he commits himself on a new issue. He tries to feel the pulse of the mass of average citizens; and as the mass, on the other hand, look to him for initiative, this is a delicate process. In European countries it is generally the view of the leaders which prevails, but it is modified by the reception which the mass give it; it becomes accentuated in the points which they appreciate; while those parts of it, or those ways of stating it, which have failed to find popular favour, fall back into the shade.

This mutual action and reaction of the makers or leaders of opinion upon the mass, and of the mass upon them, is the most curious part of the whole process by which opinion is produced. It is also that part in which there is the greatest difference between one free country and another. In some countries, the leaders count for, say, three-fourths of the product, and the mass for one-fourth only. In others these proportions are reversed. In some countries the mass of the voters are not only markedly inferior in education to the few who lead, but also diffident, more disposed to look up to their betters. In others the difference of intellectual level between those who busy themselves with politics and the average voter is far smaller. Perhaps the leader is not so well instructed a man as in the countries first referred to; perhaps the average voter is better instructed and more self-confident. Where both of these phenomena coincide, so that the difference of level is inconsiderable, public opinion will evidently be a different thing from what it is in countries where, though the Constitution has become democratic, the habits of the nation are still aristocratic. This is the difference between America and the countries of Western Europe.

CHAPTER LXXVII

GOVERNMENT BY PUBLIC OPINION

We talk of public opinion as a new force in the world, conspicuous only since governments began to be popular. Statesmen, even in the last generation, looked on it with some distrust or dislike. Sir Robert Peel, for instance, in a letter written in 1820, speaks with the air of a discoverer, of "that great compound of folly, weakness, prejudice, wrong feeling, right feeling, obstinacy, and newspaper paragraphs, which is called public opinion."

Yet opinion has really been the chief and ultimate power in nearly all nations at nearly all times. I do not mean merely the opinion of the class to which the rulers belong. Obviously the small oligarchy of Venice was influenced by the opinion of the Venetian nobility, as the absolute Czar is influenced now by the opinion of his court and his army. I mean the opinion, unspoken, unconscious, but not the less real and potent, of the masses of the people. Governments have always rested and, special cases apart, must rest, if not on the affection, then on the reverence or awe, if not on the active approval, then on the silent acquiescence, of the numerical majority. It is only by rare exception that a monarch or an oligarchy has maintained authority against the will of the people. The despotisms of the East, although they usually began in conquest, did not stand by military force but by popular assent. So did the feudal kingdoms of mediæval Europe. So do the despotisms of the Sultan (so far, at least, as regards his Mussulman subjects), of the Shah, and of the Chinese Emperor at this moment. The cases to the contrary are chiefly those of military tyrannies, such as existed in many of the Greek cities of antiquity, and in some of the Italian cities of the Renaissance, and such as exist now in the so-called republics of Central and South America. That even

the Roman Empire, that eldest child of war and conquest, did not rest on force but on the consent and good-will of its subjects is shown by the smallness of its standing armies, nearly the whole of which were employed against frontier enemies, because there was rarely any internal revolt or disturbance to be feared. Belief in authority, and the love of established order, are among the strongest forces in human nature, and therefore in polities. The first supports governments *de jure*, the latter governments *de facto*. They combine to support a government which is *de jure* as well as *de facto*. Where the subjects are displeased, their discontent may appear perhaps in the epigrams which tempered the despotism of Louis XV. in France, perhaps in the sympathy given to bandits like Robin Hood, perhaps in occasional insurrections like those of Constantinople under the Eastern Emperors. Of course, where there is no habit of combination to resist, discontent may remain for some time without this third means of expressing itself. But, even when the occupant of the throne is unpopular, the throne as an institution is in no danger so long as it can command the respect of the multitude and show itself equal to its duties.

In the earlier or simpler forms of political society public opinion is passive. It acquiesces in, rather than supports, the authority which exists, whatever its faults, because it knows of nothing better, because it sees no way to improvement, probably also because it is overawed by some kind of religious sanction. Human nature must have something to reverence, and the sovereign, because remote and potent and surrounded by pomp and splendour, seems to it mysterious and half divine. Worse administrations than those of Asiatic Turkey and Persia at this moment can hardly be imagined, yet the Mohammedan population show no signs of disaffection. The subjects of Darius and the subjects of Theebaw obeyed as a matter of course. They did not ask why they obeyed, for the habit of obedience was sufficient. They could, however, if disaffected, have at any moment overturned the throne, which had only, in both cases, an insignificant force of guards to protect it. During long ages the human mind did not ask itself — in many parts of the world does not even now ask itself — questions which seem to us the most obvious. Custom, as Pindar said, is king over all mortals and immortals, and custom prescribed obedience. When in any so

iety opinion becomes self-conscious, when it begins to realize ts force and question the rights of its rulers, that society is lready progressing, and soon finds means of organizing resistnce and compelling reform.

The difference, therefore, between despotically governed and ree countries does not consist in the fact that the latter are uled by opinion and the former by force, for both are generally uled by opinion. It consists rather in this, that in the former he people instinctively obey a power which they do not know o be really of their own creation, and to stand by their own ermission; whereas in the latter the people feel their suremacy, and consciously treat their rulers as their agents, hile the rulers obey a power which they admit to have made nd to be able to unmake them, — the popular will. In both ases force is seldom necessary, or is needed only against small roups, because the habit of obedience replaces it. Conflicts nd revolutions belong to the intermediate stage, when the eople are awakening to the sense that they are truly the upreme power in the State, but when the rulers have not yet ecome aware that their authority is merely delegated. When uperstition and the habit of submission have vanished from ne whilom subjects, when the rulers, recognizing that they re no more than agents for the citizens, have in turn formed ne habit of obedience, public opinion has become the active nd controlling director of a business in which it was before ne sleeping and generally forgotten partner. But even when nis stage has been reached, as has now happened in most vilized States, there are differences in the degree and mode and by which public opinion asserts itself. In some counies the habit of obeying rulers and officials is so strong that ne people, once they have chosen the legislature or executive ead by whom the officials are appointed, allow these officials most as wide a range of authority as in the old days of espotism. Such people have a profound respect for governent as government, and a reluctance, due either to theory or mere laziness, perhaps to both, to interfere with its action. hey say, "That is a matter for the Administration; we have othing to do with it"; and stand as much aside or submit humbly as if the government did not spring from their vn will. Perhaps they practically leave themselves, like the

Germans, in the hands of a venerated monarch or a forceful minister, giving these rulers a free hand so long as their policy moves in accord with the general sentiment of the nation, and maintains its glory. Perhaps while frequently changing their ministries, they nevertheless yield to each ministry, and to its executive subordinates all over the country, an authority great while it lasts, and largely controlling the action of the individual citizen. This seems to be still true of France. There are other countries in which, though the sphere of government is strictly limited by law, and the private citizen is little inclined to bow before an official, the habit has been to check the ministry chiefly through the legislature, and to review the conduct of both ministry and legislature only at long intervals, when an election of the legislature takes place. This has been, and to some extent is still, the case in Britain. Although the people rule, they rule not directly, but through the House of Commons, which they choose only once in four, five, or six years, and which may, at any given moment, represent rather the past than the present will of the nation.

I make these observations for the sake of indicating another form which the rule of the people may assume. We have distinguished three stages in the evolution of opinion from its unconscious and passive into its conscious and active condition. In the first it acquiesces in the will of the ruler whom it has been accustomed to obey. In the second conflicts arise between the ruling person or class, backed by those who are still disposed to obedience, on the one hand, and the more independent or progressive spirits on the other; and these conflicts are decided by arms. In the third stage the whilom ruler has submitted, and disputes are referred to the sovereign multitude, whose will is expressed at certain intervals upon slips of paper deposited in boxes, and is carried out by the minister or legislature to whom the popular mandate is entrusted. A fourth stage would be reached if the will of the majority of the citizens were to become ascertainable at all times, and without the need of its passing through a body of representatives, possibly even without the need of voting machinery at all. In such a state of things the sway of public opinion would have become more complete, because more continuous, than it is in those European countries which, like France

aly, and Britain, look chiefly to parliaments as exponents of ational sentiment. The authority would seem to remain all ie while in the mass of the citizens. Popular government ould have been pushed so far as almost to dispense with, or any rate to anticipate, the legal modes in which the majority peaks its will at the polling booths; and this informal but rect control of the multitude would dwarf, if it did not super-ede, the importance of those formal but occasional deliver-nces made at the elections of representatives. To such a ondition of things the phrase, "Rule of public opinion," might e most properly applied, for public opinion would not only ign but govern.

The mechanical difficulties, as one may call them, of working ich a method of government are obvious. How is the will of ie majority to be ascertained except by counting votes? how, ithout the greatest inconvenience, can votes be frequently ken on all the chief questions that arise? No country has et surmounted these inconveniences, though little Switzerland ith her *Referendum* has faced and partially dealt with some them. But what I desire to point out is that even where ie machinery for weighing or measuring the popular will from eek to week or month to month has not been, and is not likely be, invented, there may nevertheless be a disposition on the rt of the rulers, whether ministers or legislators, to act as if existed; that is to say, to look incessantly for manifestations current popular opinion, and to shape their course in accord-nce with their reading of those manifestations. Such a dispo-tion will be accompanied by a constant oversight of public fairs by the mass of the citizens, and by a sense on their part at they are the true governors, and that their agents, execu-ve and legislative, are rather servants than agents. Where is is the attitude of the people on the one hand and of the rsons who do the actual work of governing on the other, it ay fairly be said that there exists a kind of government mate-ally, if not formally, different from the representative system it presented itself to European thinkers and statesmen of the st generation. And it is to this kind of government that mocratic nations seem to be tending.

The state of things here noted will find illustration in what have to say in the following chapters regarding opinion in the

United States. Meanwhile a few remarks may be hazarded on the rule of public opinion in general.

The excellence of popular government lies not so much in its wisdom — for it is as apt to err as other kinds of government — as in its strength. It has been compared, ever since Sir William Temple, to a pyramid, the firmest based of all buildings. Nobody can be blamed for obeying it. There is no appeal from its decisions. Once the principle that the will of the majority honestly ascertained must prevail, has soaked into the mind and formed the habits of a nation, that nation acquires not only stability, but immense effective force. It has no need to fear discussion and agitation. It can bend all its resources to the accomplishment of its collective ends. The friction that exists in countries where the laws or institutions handed down from former generations are incompatible with the feelings and wishes of the people has disappeared. A key has been found that will unlock every door.

On the other hand, such a government is exposed to two dangers. One, the smaller one, yet sometimes troublesome, is the difficulty of ascertaining the will of the majority. I do not mean the difficulty of getting all citizens to vote, because it must be taken that those who do not vote leave their will in the hands of those who do, but the difficulty of obtaining by any machinery yet devised a quite honest record of the result of voting. Where the issues are weighty, involving immense interests of individual men or groups of men, the danger of bribery, of force, and still more of fraud in taking and counting votes, is a serious one. When there is reason to think that ballots have been tampered with, the value of the system is gone; and men are remitted to the old methods of settling their differences.

The other danger is that minorities may not sufficiently assert themselves. Where a majority has erred, the only remedy against the prolongation or repetition of its error is in the continued protests and agitation of the minority, an agitation which ought to be conducted peaceably, by voice and pen, but which must be vehement enough to rouse the people and deliver them from the consequences of their blunders. But the more complete the sway of majorities is, so much the less disposed is a minority to maintain the contest. It loses faith in its cause

and in itself, and allows its voice to be silenced by the triumphant cries of its opponents. How are men to acquiesce promptly and loyally in the decision of a majority, and yet to go on arguing against it? how can they be at once submissive and aggressive? That conceit of his own goodness and greatness which intoxicates an absolute monarch besets a sovereign people also, and the slavishness with which his ministers approach an Oriental despot may reappear in the politicians of a Western democracy. The duty, therefore, of a patriotic statesman in a country where public opinion rules, would seem to be rather to resist and correct than to encourage the dominant sentiment. He will not be content with trying to form and mould and lead it, but he will confront it, lecture it, remind it that it is fallible, rouse it out of its self-complacency. Unfortunately, courage and independence are plants which a soil impregnated with the belief in the wisdom of numbers does not tend to produce: nor is there any art known to statesmen whereby their growth can be fostered.

Experience has, however, suggested plans for lessening the risks incident to the dominance of one particular set of opinions. One plan is for the people themselves to limit their powers, *i.e.* to surround their own action and the action of their agents with restrictions of time and method which compel delay. Another is for them so to parcel out functions among many agents that no single one chosen indiscreetly, or obeying his mandate overzealously, can do much mischief, and that out of the multiplicity of agents differences of view may spring which will catch the attention of the citizens.

The temper and character of a people may supply more valuable safeguards. The country which has worked out for itself a truly free government must have done so in virtue of the vigorous individuality of its children. Such an individuality does not soon yield even to the pressure of democratic conditions. In a nation with a keen moral sense and a capacity for strong emotions, opinion based on a love of what is deemed just or good will resist the multitude when bent on evil: and if there be a great variety of social conditions, of modes of life, of religious beliefs, these will prove centres of resistance to a dominant tendency, like rocks standing up in a river, at which he whom the current sweeps downwards may

clutch. Instances might be cited even from countries wher the majority has had every source of strength at its comman — physical force, tradition, the all but universal persuasion and prejudices of the lower as well as of the higher classes — i which small minorities have triumphed, first by startling an then by leavening and convincing the majority. This the have done in virtue of that intensity of belief which is oftene found in a small sect or group, not because it is small, bu because if its belief were not intense it would not venture t hold out at all against the adverse mass. The energy of eac individual in the minority makes it in the long run a matc for a majority huger but less instinct with vitality. In a fre country more especially, ten men who care are a match for hundred who do not.

Such natural compensations as this occur in the physical a well as in the spiritual and moral world, and preserve both But they are compensations on which the practical statesma cannot safely rely, for they are partial, they are uncertain, an they probably tend to diminish with the progress of democrac The longer public opinion has ruled, the more absolute is th authority of the majority likely to become, the less likely a energetic minorities to arise, the more are politicians likely occupy themselves, not in forming opinion, but in discoverin and hastening to obey it.

CHAPTER LXXVIII

HOW PUBLIC OPINION RULES IN AMERICA

It was observed in last chapter that the phrase "government by public opinion" is most specifically applicable to a system wherein the will of the people acts directly and constantly upon its executive and legislative agents. A government may be both free and good without being subject to this continuous and immediate control. Still this is the goal toward which the extension of the suffrage, the more rapid diffusion of news, and the practice of self-government itself, necessarily lead free nations; and it may even be said that one of their chief problems is to devise means whereby the national will shall be most fully expressed, most quickly known, most unresistingly and cheerfully obeyed. Delays and jerks are avoided, friction and consequent waste of force are prevented, when the nation itself watches all the play of the machinery and guides its workman by a glance. Towards this goal the Americans have marched with steady steps, unconsciously as well as consciously. No other people now stands so near it.

Of all the experiments which America has made, this is that which best deserves study, for her solution of the problem differs from all previous solutions, and she has shown more boldness in trusting public opinion, in recognizing and giving effect to it, than has yet been shown elsewhere. Towering over Presidents and State governors, over Congress and State legislatures, over conventions and the vast machinery of party, public opinion stands out, in the United States, as the great source of power, the master of servants who tremble before it.

For the sake of making clear what follows, I will venture to recapitulate what was said in an earlier chapter as to the three forms which government has taken in free countries. First came primary assemblies, such as those of the Greek republics

of antiquity, or those of the early Teutonic tribes, which have survived in a few Swiss cantons. The whole people met, debated current questions, decided them by its votes, chose those who were to carry out its will. Such a system of direct popular government is possible only in small communities, and in this day of large States has become a matter rather of antiquarian curiosity than of practical moment.

In the second form, power belongs to representative bodies, Parliaments and Chambers. The people in their various local areas elect men, supposed to be their wisest or most influential, to deliberate for them, resolve for them, choose their executive servants for them. They give these representatives a tolerably free hand, leaving them in power for a considerable space of time, and allowing them to act unchecked, except in so far as custom, or possibly some fundamental law, limits their discretion. This is done in the faith that the Chamber will feel its responsibility and act for the best interests of the country, carrying out what it believes to be the wishes of the majority, unless it should be convinced that in some particular point it knows better than the majority what the interests of the country require. Such a system has long prevailed in England, and the English model has been widely imitated on the continent of Europe and in the British colonies.

The third is something between the other two. It may be regarded either as an attempt to apply the principle of primary assemblies to large countries, or as a modification of the representative system in the direction of direct popular sovereignty. There is still a legislature, but it is elected for so short a time and checked in so many ways that much of its power and dignity has departed. Ultimate authority is not with it, but with the people, who have fixed limits beyond which it cannot go, and who use it merely as a piece of machinery for carrying out their wishes and settling points of detail for them. The supremacy of their will is expressed in the existence of a Constitution placed above the legislature, although capable of alteration by a direct popular vote. The position of the representatives has been altered. They are conceived of, not as wise and strong men chosen to govern, but as delegates under specific orders to be renewed at short intervals.

This is the form established in the United States. Congress

sits for two years only. It is strictly limited by the Constitution, and by the coexistence of the State governments, which the Constitution protects. It has (except by way of impeachment) no control over the Federal executive, which is directly named by and responsible to the people. So, too, the State legislatures sit for short periods, do not appoint the State executives, are hedged in by the prohibitions of the State constitutions. The people frequently legislate directly by enacting or altering a constitution. The principle of popular sovereignty could hardly be expressed more unmistakably. Allowing for the differences to which the vast size of the country gives rise, the mass of the citizens may be deemed as directly the supreme power as the Assembly was at Athens or Syracuse.[1] The only check on the mass is that which they have themselves imposed, and which the ancient democracies did not possess, the difficulty of changing a rigid constitution. And this difficulty is serious only as regards the Federal Constitution.

As this is the most developed form of popular government, so is it also the form which most naturally produces what I have called government by public opinion. Popular government may be said to exist wherever all power is lodged in and issues from the people. Government by public opinion exists where the wishes and views of the people prevail, even before they have been conveyed through the regular law-appointed organs, and without the need of their being so conveyed. As in a limited monarchy the king, however powerful, must act through certain officers and in a defined legal way, whereas in a despotism he may act just as he pleases, and his initial written on a scrap of paper is as sure of obedience as his full name signed to a parchment authenticated by the Great Seal or the counter-signature of a minister, so where the power of the people is absolute, legislators and administrators are quick to catch its wishes in whatever way they may be indicated, and do not care to wait for the methods which the law prescribes. This happens in America. Opinion rules more fully, more directly, than under the second of the systems described above.

[1] Rome is a somewhat peculiar case, because she left far more power to her non-representative Senate and to her magistrates than the Greek democracies did to their councils or officials. See Chapter XXV. in Vol. I.

A consideration of the nature of the State governments, a of the National government, will show that legal theory as wel as popular self-confidence gives birth to this rule of opinion Supreme power resides in the whole mass of citizens. The have prescribed, in the strict terms of a legal document, th form of government. They alone have the right to change i and that only in a particular way. They have committed onl a part of their sovereignty to their executive and legislativ agents, reserving the rest to themselves. Hence their will, o in other words, public opinion, is constantly felt by these agent to be, legally as well as practically, the controlling authority In England, Parliament is the nation, not merely by a lega fiction, but because the nation looks to Parliament only, havin neither reserved any authority to itself nor bestowed any els where. In America, Congress is not the nation, and does no claim to be so.

The ordinary functions and business of government, th making of laws, the imposing of taxes, the interpretation laws and their execution, the administration of justice, th conduct of foreign relations, are parcelled out among a numbe of bodies and persons whose powers are so carefully balance and touch at so many points that there is a constant risk conflicts, even of deadlocks. Some of the difficulties then arising are dealt with by the Courts, as questions of the inte pretation of the Constitution. But in many cases the interve tion of the courts, which can act only in a suit between partie comes too late to deal with the matter, which may be an urge one; and in some cases there is nothing for the courts to decid because each of the conflicting powers is within its legal rigl The Senate, for instance, may refuse the measures which t House thinks necessary. The President may veto bills pass by both Houses, and there may not be a two-thirds majority pass them over his veto. Congress may urge the President take a certain course, and the President may refuse. T President may propose a treaty to the Senate, and the Sena may reject it. In such cases there is a stoppage of gover mental action which may involve loss to the country. T master, however, is at hand to settle the quarrels of his s vants. If the question be a grave one, and the mind of t country clear upon it, public opinion throws its weight into o

or other scale, and its weight is decisive. Should opinion be nearly balanced, it is no doubt difficult to ascertain, till the next election arrives, which of many discordant cries is really the prevailing voice. This difficulty must, in a large country, where frequent plebiscites are impossible, be endured; and it may be well, when the preponderance of opinion is not great, that serious decisions should not be quickly taken. The general truth remains that a system of government by checks and balances specially needs the presence of an arbiter to incline the scale in favour of one or other of the balanced authorities, and that public opinion must therefore be more frequently invoked and more constantly active in America than in other countries.

Those who invented this machinery of checks and balances were anxious not so much to develop public opinion as to resist and build up breakwaters against it. No men were less revolutionary in spirit than the founders of the American Constitution. They had made a revolution in the name of Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights: they were penetrated by a sense of the dangers incident to democracy. They conceived of popular opinion as aggressive, unreasoning, passionate, futile, and a breeder of mob violence. We shall presently inquire whether this conception has been verified. Meantime be it noted that the efforts made in 1787 to divide authority and, so to speak, force the current of the popular will into many small channels instead of permitting it to rush down one broad bed, have really tended to exalt public opinion above the regular legally appointed organs of government. Each of these organs is too small to form opinion, too narrow to express it, too weak to give effect to it. It grows up not in Congress, not in State legislatures, not in those great conventions which frame platforms and choose candidates, but at large among the people. It is expressed in voices everywhere. It rules as a pervading and impalpable power, like the ether which passes through all things. It binds all the parts of the complicated system together, and gives them whatever unity of aim and action they possess.

There is also another reason why the opinion of the whole nation is a more important factor in the government of the United States than anywhere in Europe. In Europe there has

always been a governing class, a set of persons whom birth, or wealth, or education has raised above their fellows, and to whom has been left the making of public opinion together with the conduct of administration and the occupancy of places in the legislature. The public opinion of Germany, Italy, France, and England has been substantially the opinion of the class which wears black coats and lives in good houses, though in the two latter countries it has of late years been increasingly affected by the opinion of the classes socially lower. Although the members of the English Parliament now obey the mass of their constituents when the latter express a distinct wish, still the influence which plays most steadily on them and permeates them is the opinion of a class or classes, and not of the whole nation. The class to which the great majority of members of both Houses belong (*i.e.* the landowners and the persons occupied in professions and in the higher walks of commerce) is the class which chiefly forms and expresses what is called public opinion. Even in these days of vigilant and exacting constituencies one sees many members of the House of Commons the democratic robustness or provincial crudity of whose ideas melts like wax under the influence of fashionable dinner-parties and club smoking-rooms. It is a common complaint that it is hard for a member to "keep touch" with the opinion of the masses.

In the United States public opinion is the opinion of the whole nation, with little distinction of social classes. The politicians, including the members of Congress and of State legislatures, are, perhaps not (as Americans sometimes insinuate) below, yet certainly not above the average level of their constituents. They find no difficulty in keeping touch with outside opinion. Washington or Albany may corrupt them but not in the way of modifying their political ideas. They do not aspire to the function of forming opinion. They are like the Eastern slave who says "I hear and obey." Nor is there any one class or set of men, or any one "social layer," which more than another originates ideas and builds up political doctrine for the mass. The opinion of the nation is the resultant of the views, not of a number of classes, but of a multitude of individuals, diverse, no doubt, from one another but, for the purposes of politics far less diverse than if they were members of groups defined by social rank or by property

The consequences are noteworthy. Statesmen cannot, as in Europe, declare any sentiment which they find telling on their friends or their antagonists to be confined to the rich, or to the governing class, and to be opposed to the general sentiment of the people. In America you cannot appeal from the classes to the masses. What the employer thinks, his workmen think.[1] What the wholesale merchant feels, the retail storekeeper feels, and the poorer customers feel. Divisions of opinion are vertical and not horizontal. Obviously this makes opinion more easily ascertained, while increasing its force as a governing power, and gives to the whole people, without distinction of classes, a clearer and fuller consciousness of being the rulers of their country than European peoples have. Every man knows that he is himself a part of the government, bound by duty as well as by self-interest to devote part of his time and thoughts to it. He may neglect this duty, but he admits it to be a duty. So the system of party organizations already described is built upon this theory; and as this system is more recent, and is the work of practical politicians, it is even better evidence of the general acceptance of the doctrine than are the provisions of Constitutions. Compare European countries, or compare the other States of the New World. In the so-called republics of Central and South America a small section of the inhabitants pursue politics, while the rest follow their ordinary avocations, indifferent to elections and pronunciamentos and revolutions. In Germany, and in the German and Slavonic parts of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, people think of the government as a great machine which will go on, whether they put their hand to or not, a few persons working it, and all the rest paying and looking on. The same thing is largely true of republican France, and of semi-republican Italy, where free government is still a novelty, and local self-government in its infancy. Even in England, though the sixty years that have passed since the great Reform Act have brought many new ideas with them, the ordinary voter is still far from feeling, as the American does, that the government is his own, and he individually responsible for its conduct.

[1] Of course I do not include questions specially relating to labour, in which there may be a direct conflict of interests.

CHAPTER LXXIX

ORGANS OF PUBLIC OPINION

How does this vague, fluctuating, complex thing we call public opinion — omnipotent yet indeterminate, a sovereign to whose voice every one listens, yet whose words, because he speaks with as many tongues as the waves of a boisterous sea, it is so hard to catch — how does public opinion express itself in America? By what organs is it declared, and how, since these organs often contradict one another, can it be discovered which of them speak most truly for the mass? The more completely popular sovereignty prevails in a country, so much the more important is it that the organs of opinion should be adequate to its expression, prompt, full, and unmistakable in their utterances. And in such European countries as England and France, it is now felt that the most successful party leader is he who can best divine from these organs what the decision of the people will be when a direct appeal is made to them at an election.

I have already observed that in America public opinion is a power not satisfied with choosing executive and legislative agents at certain intervals, but continuously watching and guiding those agents, who look to it, not merely for a vote of approval when the next general election arrives, but also for directions which they are eager to obey, so soon as they have learnt their meaning. The efficiency of the organs of opinion is therefore more essential to the government of the United States than even to England or to France.

An organ of public opinion is, however, not merely the expression of views and tendencies already in existence, but a factor in further developing and moulding the judgment of the people. Opinion makes opinion. Men follow in the path which they see others treading, they hasten to adopt the view that seems

kely to prevail. Hence every weighty voice, be it that of a peaker, or an association, or a public meeting, or a newspaper, s at once the disclosure of an existing force and a further force nfluencing others. This fact, while it multiplies the organs hrough which opinion is expressed, increases the difficulty of sing them aright, because every voice seeks to represent itself s that of the greater, or at least of a growing number.

The press, and particularly the newspaper press, stands by ommon consent first among the organs of opinion. Yet few nings are harder than to estimate its power, and state precisely n what that power consists.

Newspapers are influential in three ways — as narrators, as dvocates, and as weathercocks. They report events, they dvance arguments, they indicate by their attitude what those ho conduct them and are interested in their circulation take to e the prevailing opinion of their readers. In the first of these egards the American press is the most active in the world. Nothing escapes it which can attract any class of readers. It oes not even confine itself to events that have happened, ut is apt to describe others which may possibly have hap- ened, however slight the evidence for them: *pariter facta atque fecta canebat.* This habit affects its worth as an historic ecord and its influence with sober-minded people. But it is natural result of the high pressure under which the news- aper business is carried on. The appetite for news, and for ghly spiced or "sensational" news, is enormous, and journal- ts working under keen competition and in unceasing haste ke their chance of the correctness of the information they ceive.

Much harm there is, but possibly as much good. It is related an old barrister that he observed: "When I was young I st a good many causes which I ought to have won, and now, at I have grown old and experienced, I win a good many uses which I ought to lose. So, on the whole, justice has en done." If in its heedlessness the press sometimes causes in to the innocent, it does a great and necessary service exposing evil-doers, many of whom would escape were it ver to speak except upon sufficient evidence. It is a watch- g whose noisy bark must be tolerated, even when the person no approaches has no bad intent. No doubt charges are so

promiscuously and often so lightly made as to tell less than they would in a country where the law of libel was more frequently appealed to. But many abuses are unveiled, many more prevented by the fear of publicity.

Although the leading American newspapers contain far more non-political matter than those of Europe, they also contain, especially, of course, before any important election, more domestic political intelligence than any, except perhaps two or three, of the chief English journals. The public has the benefit of hearing everything it can wish, and more than it ought to wish, to know about every occurrence and every personality. The intelligence is not quite of the same kind as in England or France. There are fewer reports of speeches, because fewer speeches of an argumentative nature are made, but more of the schemes and doings of conventions and political cliques, as well as of the sayings of individuals.

As the advocates of political doctrines, newspapers are of course powerful, because they are universally read and often ably written. They are accused of unfairness and vituperation, but I doubt if there is any marked difference in this respect between their behaviour and that of European papers at a time of excitement. Nor could I discover that their arguments were any more frequently than in Europe addressed to prejudice rather than to reason. In America, however, a leading article carries less weight of itself, being discounted by the shrewd reader as the sort of thing which the paper must of course be expected to say, and is effective only when it takes hold of some fact (real or supposed), and hammers it into the public mind. This is what the unclean politician has to fear. Mere abuse he does not care for, but constant references to and comments on misdeeds of which he cannot clear himself tell in the long run against him.

The influence attributed to the press is evidenced not only by the posts (especially foreign legations) frequently bestowed upon the owners or editors of leading journals, but by the current appeals made to good party men to take in only stanch party papers, and by the threats to "read out" of the party journals which show a dangerous independence. Nevertheless if the party press be estimated as a factor in the formation of opinion, whether by argument or by authority, it must be

eemed less powerful in America than in Europe, because its verage public is shrewder, more independent, less readily im-ressed by the mysterious "we." I doubt if there be any aper by which any considerable number of people swear; and m sure that comparatively few quote their favourite journal s an oracle in the way many persons still do in England. The ast area of the republic and the absence of a capital prevent ny one paper from winning its way to predominance, even in ny particular section of the country. Herein one notes a emarkable contrast to the phenomena of the Old World. lthough the chief American newspapers are, regarded as com-iercial properties, "bigger things" than those of Europe, ney do not dominate the whole press as a few journals do in ost European countries. Or, to put the same thing differ-ntly, in England, and much the same may be said of France nd Germany, some twenty newspapers cover nine-tenths of ne reading public, whereas in America any given twenty papers ould not cover one-third.

In those cities, moreover, where one finds really strong papers, ach is exposed to a severer competition than in Europe, for in ties most people look at more than one newspaper. The late Ir. Horace Greeley, who for many years owned and edited the *ew York Tribune*, is the most notable case of an editor who, by is journalistic talent and great self-confidence, acquired such a ersonal influence as to make multitudes watch for and follow is deliverances. He was to the later Whig party and the earlier epublican party much what Katkoff was in our own time to ne National party in Russia, and had, of course, a far greater ost of readers.

It is chiefly in its third capacity as an index and mirror of ublic opinion that the press is looked to. This is the function chiefly aims at discharging; and public men feel that in owing deference to it they are propitiating, and inviting the mmands of, public opinion itself. In worshipping the deity ou learn to conciliate the priest. But as every possible view d tendency finds expression through some organ in the press, e problem is to discover which views have got popular rength behind them. Professed party journals are of little e, though one may sometimes discover from the way they vance an argument whether they think it will really tell on

the opposite party, or use it only because it falls within their own programme. More may therefore be gleaned from the independent or semi-independent journals, whereof there are three classes: papers which, like two or three in the great cities, generally support one party, but are apt to fly off from it when they disapprove its conduct, or think the people will do so; papers which devote themselves mainly to news, though they may give editorial aid to one or other party according to the particular issue involved, and papers not professedly or primarily political. Of this last class the most important members are the religious weeklies, to whose number and influence few parallels can be discovered in Europe. They are mostly either neutral or somewhat loosely attached to their party, usually the Republican party, because it began as the Free Soil party, and includes, in the North, the greater number of serious-minded people. It is only on great occasions, such as a presidential election, or when some moral issue arises, that they discuss current politics at length. When they do, great is their power, because they are deemed to be less "thirled" to a party or a leader, because they speak from a moral standpoint, and because they are read on Sunday, a time of leisure, when their seed is more likely to strike root. The monthly magazines deal less with politics than do the leading English monthlies, but their influence seems to grow with the increasing amount of excellent writing they contain.

During presidential contests much importance is attributed to the attitude of the leading papers of the great cities, for the revolt of any one from its party — as, for instance, the revolt of several Republican papers during the election of 1884 — indicates discontent and danger. Where a schism exists in a State party, the bosses of one or other section will sometimes try to capture and manipulate the smaller country papers so as to convey the impression that their faction is gaining ground. Newspapers take more notice of one another, both by quoting from friendly sheets and by attacking hostile ones than is usual in England, so that any incident or witticism which can tell in a campaign is at once taken up and read in a day or two in every city from Detroit to New Orleans.

The Americans have invented an organ for catching, measuring, and indicating opinion almost unknown in Europe, in

their practice of citing the private deliverances of prominent men. Sometimes this is done by publishing a letter, addressed not to the newspaper but to a friend, who gives it the publicity for which it was designed. Sometimes it is announced how the prominent man is going to vote at the next election. A short paragraph will state that Judge So-and-So, or Dr. Blank, an eminent clergyman, is going to "bolt" the presidential or State ticket of his party; and perhaps the reasons assigned for his conduct follow. Of the same nature, but more elaborate, is the interview, in which the prominent man unbosoms himself to a reporter, giving his view of the political position in a manner less formal and obtrusive, but not less effective than that of a letter to the editor. Sometimes, at the editor's suggestion, or of his own motion, a brisk reporter waits on the leading citizen and invites the expression of his views, which is rarely refused, though, of course, it may be given in a guarded and unsatisfying way. Sometimes the leading citizen himself, when he has a fact on which to comment, or views to communicate, sends for the reporter, who is only too glad to attend. The plan has many conveniences, among which is the possibility of disavowing any particular phrase as one which has failed to convey the speaker's true meaning. All these devices help the men of eminence to impress their ideas on the public, while they show that there is a part of the public which desires such guidance.

Taking the American press all in all, it seems to serve the expression, and subserve the formation, of public opinion more fully than does the press of any part of the European continent, and not less fully than that of England. Individual newspapers and journalists altogether may enjoy less power than is the case in some countries of the Old World; but if this be so, the cause is to be found, not in the inferior capacity of editors and writers, but in the superior independence of the reading public, who regard their paper differently from the English, while finding it no less necessary a part of the mechanism of free government. The American press may not be above the moral level of the average good citizen, — in no country does one either expect or find it to be so, — but it is above the level of the Machine politicians in the cities. In the war waged against these worthies, the newspapers of New York, Boston, Phila-

delphia, and Chicago have been one of the most effective battalions.

While believing that a complete picture of current opinion can be more easily gathered from American than from English journals, I do not mean to imply that they supply all a politician needs. Any one who has made it his business to feel the pulse of the public of his own country must be sensible that when he has been travelling abroad for a few weeks, he is sure, no matter how diligently he peruses the leading home papers of all shades, to "lose touch" of the current sentiment of the country in its actuality. The journals seem to convey to him what their writers wish to be believed, and not necessarily what the people are really thinking; and he feels more and more as weeks pass the need of an hour's talk with four or five discerning friends of different types of thought, from whom he will gather how current facts strike and move the minds of his countrymen. Every prudent man keeps a circle of such friends, by whom he can test and correct his own impressions better than by the almost official utterances of the party journals. So in America there is much to be learnt from conversation with judicious observers outside politics and typical representatives of political sections and social classes, which the most diligent study of the press will not give.

Letters on public questions from their constituents to members of Congress or of State legislatures seem to be less frequent than in England, where politicians find them no contemptible indication of the topics that occupy the mind of the people.

Except during electoral campaigns, public meetings, and especially public political dinners, play a smaller part in the political life of the United States than in that of Western Europe. Meetings were, of course, more frequent during the struggle against slavery than they need be in these quieter times, yet the difference between European and American practice cannot be wholly due to the more stirring questions which have latterly roused Europeans. A meeting in America is usually held for some practical object, such as the selection of candidates or the creation of an organization, less often as a mere demonstration of opinion and means of instruction. When instruction is desired, the habit is to bring down a man

of note to give a political lecture, paying him from $75 to $100, or perhaps even $150, nor is it thought unbecoming for senators and ex-senators to accept such fees. The meetings during an election campaign, which are numerous enough, do not always provide argumentative speaking, for those who attend are assumed to be all members of one party, sound already, and needing nothing but an extra dose of enthusiasm; but since the protective tariff has become a leading issue, the proportion of reasoning to declamation has increased. Members of Congress do not deliver such annual discourses to their constituents as it has become the fashion for members of the House of Commons to deliver in England; and have indeed altogether an easier time of it as regards speaking, though a far harder one as regards the getting of places for their constituents. American visitors to England seem surprised and even a little edified when they find how much meetings are made to do there in the way of eliciting and cultivating opinion among the electors. I have often heard them praise the English custom, and express the wish that it prevailed in their own country.

As the ceaseless desire of every public man is to know which way the people are going, and as the polls are the only sure index of opinion, every election, however small, is watched with close attention. Now elections are in the United States as plentiful as revolutions in Peru. The vote cast for each party in a city, or State legislature district, or congressional district, or State, at the last previous election, is compared with that now cast, and inferences drawn as to what will happen at the next State or presidential election. Special interest attaches to the State pollings that immediately precede a presidential election, for they not only indicate the momentary temper of the particular voters but tell upon the country generally, affecting that large number who wish to be on the winning side. As happens in the similar case of what are called "by-elections" to the House of Commons in England, too much weight is generally attributed to these contests, which are sometimes, though less frequently than in England, decided by purely local causes. Such elections, however, give the people opportunities of expressing their displeasure at any recent misconduct chargeable to a party, and sometimes lead the

party managers to repent in time and change their course be fore the graver struggle arrives.

Associations are created, extended, and worked in the United States more quickly and effectively than in any other country In nothing does the executive talent of the people better shin than in the promptitude wherewith the idea of an organizatio for a common object is taken up, in the instinctive disciplin that makes every one who joins in starting it fall into his place in the practical, business-like turn which the discussions forth with take. Thus in 1884, the cattlemen of the further West finding difficulties in driving their herds from Texas to Wyo ming and Montana, suddenly convoked a great convention i Chicago which presented a plan for the establishment of a broa route from South to North, and resolved on the steps prope for obtaining the necessary legislation. Here, however, we ar concerned with associations only as organs for focussing an propagating opinion. The greater ones, such as the temperanc societies, ramify over the country and constitute a species o political organization which figures in State and even in pres dential contests. Nearly every "cause," philanthropic, ecc nomic, or social, has something of the kind. Local association or committees are often formed in cities to combat the Machin politicians in the interests of municipal reform; while ever important election calls into being a number of "campaig clubs," which work while the struggle lasts, and are then di solved. For these money is soon forthcoming; it is mor plentiful than in Europe, and subscribed more readily fo political purposes.

Such associations have great importance in the developmen of opinion, for they rouse attention, excite discussion, formulat principles, submit plans, embolden and stimulate their member produce that impression of a spreading movement which goe so far towards success with a sympathetic and sensitive peopl *Possunt quia posse videntur* is doubly true in America as regard the spectators as well as the actors, because the appearance o strength gathers recruits as well as puts heart into the origin combatants. Unexpected support gathers to every rising caus If it be true that individuality is too weak in the country, stron and self-reliant statesmen or publicists too few, so much th greater is the value of this habit of forming associations, for

creates new centres of force and motion, and nourishes young causes and unpopular doctrines into self-confident aggressiveness. But in any case they are useful as indications of the tendencies at work and the forces behind these tendencies. By watching the attendance at the meetings, the language held, the amount of zeal displayed, a careful observer can discover what ideas are getting hold of the popular mind.

One significant difference between the formation and expression of opinion in the United States and in Europe remains to be noted. In England and Wales 40 per cent of the population was in 1891 to be found in sixty-two cities with a population exceeding 50,000. In France opinion is mainly produced in, and policy, except upon a few of the broadest issues, dictated by, the urban population, though its number falls much below that of the rural. In America the cities with a population exceeding 50,000 inhabitants were, in 1890, fifty-eight in number, with an aggregate population of 12,348,775, that is, 20 per cent of the total population. The number of persons to the square mile is 498 in England and Wales, only 21 in the United States, excluding Alaska. Hence those influences formative of opinion which city life produces, the presence of political leaders, the influence they personally diffuse, the striking out and testing of ideas in conversation, may tell somewhat less on the American than they do on the English people, crowded together in their little island, and would tell much less but for the stronger social instincts of the Americans and the more general habit of reading daily newspapers.

In endeavouring to gather the tendencies of popular opinion, the task of an American statesman is in some respects easier than that of his English compeer. As social distinctions count for less in America, the same tendencies are more generally and uniformly diffused through all classes, and it is not necessary to discount so many special points of difference which may affect the result. As social intercourse is easier, and there is less *gêne* between a person in the higher and one in the humbler ranks, a man can better pick up in conversation the sentiments of his poorer neighbours. Moreover, the number of persons who belong to neither party, or on whom party allegiance sits loosely, is relatively smaller than in England, so the unpredictable vote — the doubtful element which in-

cludes those called in England "arm-chair politicians" — does not so much disturb calculations. Nevertheless, the task of discerning changes and predicting consequences is always a difficult one, in which the most skilful observers may err. The country is large, the din of voices is incessant, the parties are in many places nearly balanced. There are frequent small changes from which it would be rash to infer any real movement of opinion, even as he who comes down to the beach must watch many wavelets break in ripples on the sand before he can tell whether the tide be ebbing or flowing.

It may be asked how, if the organs of public opinion give so often an uncertain sound, public opinion can with truth be said not only to reign but to govern. The answer is that a sovereign is not the less a sovereign because his commands are sometimes misheard or misreported. In America every one listens for them. Those who manage the affairs of the country obey to the best of their hearing. They do not, as has been heretofore the case in Europe, act on their own view, and ask the people to ratify: they take the course which they believe the people at the moment desire. Leaders do not, as sometimes still happens in England, seek to force or anticipate opinion; or if they do, they suffer for the blunder by provoking a reaction. The people must not be hurried. A statesman is not expected to move ahead of them; he must rather seem to follow, though if he has the courage to tell the people that they are wrong, and refuse to be the instrument of their errors, he will be all the more respected. Those who fail because they mistake eddies and cross currents for the main stream of opinion, fail more often from some personal bias, or from vanity, or from hearkening to a clique of adherents, than from want of materials for observation. A man who can disengage himself from preconceptions, who is in genuine sympathy with his countrymen, and possesses the art of knowing where to look for typical manifestations of their sentiments, will find the organs through which opinion finds expression more adequate as well as more abundant in America than they are in any other country.

CHAPTER LXXX

NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AS MOULDING PUBLIC OPINION

As the public opinion of a people is even more directly than its political institutions the reflection and expression of its character, we may begin the analysis of opinion in America by noting some of those general features of national character which give tone and colour to the people's thoughts and feelings on politics. There are, of course, varieties proper to different classes, and to different parts of the vast territory of the Union; but it is well to consider first such characteristics as belong to the nation as a whole, and afterwards to examine the various classes and districts of the country. And when I speak of the nation, I mean the native Americans. What follows is not applicable to the recent immigrants from Europe, and, of course, even less applicable to the Southern negroes; though both these elements are potent by their votes.

The Americans are a good-natured people, kindly, helpful to one another, disposed to take a charitable view even of wrong-doers. Their anger sometimes flames up, but the fire is soon extinct. Nowhere is cruelty more abhorred. Even a mob lynching a horse thief in the West has consideration for the criminal, and will give him a good drink of whisky before he is strung up. Cruelty to slaves was unusual while slavery lasted, the best proof of which is the quietness of the slaves during the war when all the men and many of the boys of the South were serving in the Confederate armies. As everybody knows, juries are more lenient to offences of all kinds but one, offences against women, than they are anywhere in Europe. The Southern "rebels" were soon forgiven; and though civil wars are proverbially bitter, there have been few struggles in which the combatants did so many little friendly acts for one another, few in which even the vanquished have so quickly buried their

resentments. It is true that newspapers and public speakers say hard things of their opponents; but this is a part of the game, and is besides a way of relieving their feelings: the bark is sometimes the louder in order that a bite may not follow. Vindictiveness shown by a public man excites general disapproval, and the maxim of letting bygones be bygones is pushed so far that an offender's misdeeds are often forgotten when they ought to be remembered against him.

All the world knows that they are a humorous people. They are as conspicuously the purveyors of humour to the nineteenth century as the French were the purveyors of wit to the eighteenth. Nor is this sense of the ludicrous side of things confined to a few brilliant writers. It is diffused among the whole people; it colours their ordinary life, and gives to their talk that distinctively new flavour which a European palate enjoys. Their capacity for enjoying a joke against themselves was oddly illustrated at the outset of the Civil War, a time of stern excitement, by the merriment which arose over the hasty retreat of the Federal troops at the battle of Bull Run. When William M. Tweed was ruling and robbing New York, and had set on the bench men who were openly prostituting justice, the citizens found the situation so amusing that they almost forgot to be angry. Much of President Lincoln's popularity, and much also of the gift he showed for restoring confidence to the North at the darkest moments of the war, was due to the humorous way he used to turn things, conveying the impression of not being himself uneasy, even when he was most so.

That indulgent view of mankind which I have already mentioned, a view odd in a people whose ancestors were penetrated with the belief in original sin, is strengthened by this wish to get amusement out of everything. The want of seriousness which it produces may be more apparent than real. Yet it has its significance; for people become affected by the language they use, as we see men grow into cynics when they have acquired the habit of talking cynicism for the sake of effect.

They are a hopeful people. Whether or no they are right in calling themselves a new people, they certainly seem to feel in their veins the bounding pulse of youth. They see a long vista of years stretching out before them, in which they will have time enough to cure all their faults, to overcome all the obstacles

that block their path. They look at their enormous territory with its still only half-explored sources of wealth, they reckon up the growth of their population and their products, they contrast the comfort and intelligence of their labouring classes with the condition of the masses in the Old World. They remember the dangers that so long threatened the Union from the slave power, and the rebellion it raised, and see peace and harmony now restored, the South more prosperous and contented than at any previous epoch, perfect good feeling between all sections of the country. It is natural for them to believe in their star. And this sanguine temper makes them tolerant of evils which they regard as transitory, removable as soon as time can be found to root them up.

They have unbounded faith in what they call the People and in a democratic system of government. The great States of the European continent are distracted by the contests of Republicans and Monarchists, and of rich and poor, — contests which go down to the foundations of government, and in France are further embittered by religious passions. Even in England the ancient Constitution is always under repair, and while many think it is being ruined by changes, others hold that still greater changes are needed to make it tolerable. No such questions trouble native American minds, for nearly everybody believes, and everybody declares, that the frame of government is in its main lines so excellent that such reforms as seem called for need not touch those lines, but are required only to protect the Constitution from being perverted by the parties. Hence a further confidence that the people are sure to decide right in the long run, a confidence inevitable and essential in a government which refers every question to the arbitrament of numbers. There have, of course, been instances where the once insignificant minority proved to have been wiser than the majority of the moment. Such was eminently the case in the great slavery struggle. But here the minority prevailed by growing into a majority as events developed the real issues, so that this also has been deemed a ground for holding that all minorities which have right on their side will bring round their antagonists, and in the long run win by voting power. If you ask an intelligent citizen why he so holds, he will answer that truth and justice are sure to make their way into

the minds and consciences of the majority. This is deemed an axiom, and the more readily so deemed, because truth is identified with common sense, the quality which the average citizen is most confidently proud of possessing.

This feeling shades off into another, externally like it, but at bottom distinct — the feeling not only that the majority, be it right or wrong, will and must prevail, but that its being the majority proves it to be right. This idea, which appears in the guise sometimes of piety and sometimes of fatalism, seems to be no contemptible factor in the present character of the people. It will be more fully dealt with in a later chapter.

The Americans are an educated people, compared with the whole mass of the population in any European country except Switzerland, parts of Germany, Norway, Iceland, and Scotland — that is to say, the average of knowledge is higher, the habit of reading and thinking more generally diffused, than in any other country. (I speak, of course, of the native Americans, excluding negroes and recent immigrants.) They know the Constitution of their own country, they follow public affairs, they join in local government and learn from it how government must be carried on, and in particular how discussion must be conducted in meetings, and its results tested at elections. The Town Meeting has been the most perfect school of self-government in any modern country. In villages, they still exercise their minds on theological questions, debating points of Christian doctrine with no small acuteness. Women in particular, though their chief reading is fiction and theology, pick up at the public schools and from the popular magazines far more miscellaneous information than the women of any European country possess, and this naturally tells on the intelligence of the men.

That the education of the masses is nevertheless a superficial education goes without saying. It is sufficient to enable them to think they know something about the great problems of politics: insufficient to show them how little they know. The public elementary school gives everybody the key to knowledge in making reading and writing familiar, but it has not time to teach him how to use the key, whose use is in fact by the pressure of daily work, almost confined to the newspaper and the magazine. So we may say that if the politica

education of the average American voter be compared with that of the average voter in Europe, it stands high; but if it be compared with the functions which the theory of the American government lays on him, which its spirit implies, which the methods of its party organization assume, its inadequacy is manifest. This observation, however, is not so much a reproach to the schools, which generally do what English schools omit — instruct the child in the principles of the Constitution — as a tribute to the height of the ideal which the American conception of popular rule sets up.

For the functions of the citizen are not, as has hitherto been the case in Europe, confined to the choosing of legislators, who are then left to settle issues of policy and select executive rulers. The American citizen is one of the governors of the Republic. Issues are decided and rulers selected by the direct popular vote. Elections are so frequent that to do his duty at them a citizen ought to be constantly watching public affairs with a full comprehension of the principles involved in them, and a judgment of the candidates derived from a criticism of their arguments as well as a recollection of their past careers. The instruction received in the common schools and from the newspapers, and supposed to be developed by the practice of primaries and conventions, while it makes the voter deem himself capable of governing, does not fit him to weigh the real merits of statesmen, to discern the true grounds on which questions ought to be decided, to note the drift of events and discover the direction in which parties are being carried. He is like a sailor who knows the spars and ropes of the ship and is expert in working her, but is ignorant of geography and navigation; who can perceive that some of the officers are smart and others dull, but cannot judge which of them is qualified to use the sextant or will best keep his head during a hurricane.

They are a moral and well-conducted people. Setting aside the *colluvies gentium* which one finds in Western mining camps, and which popular literature has presented to Europeans as far larger than it really is, setting aside also the rabble of a few great cities and the negroes of the South, the average of temperance, chastity, truthfulness, and general probity is somewhat higher than in any of the great nations of Europe. The

instincts of the native farmer or artisan are almost invariably kindly and charitable. He respects the law; he is deferential to women and indulgent to children; he attaches an almost excessive value to the possession of a genial manner and the observance of domestic duties.

They are also a religious people. It is not merely that they respect religion and its ministers, for that one might say of Russians or Sicilians, not merely that they are assiduous church-goers and Sunday-school teachers, but that they have an intelligent interest in the form of faith they profess, are pious without superstition, and zealous without bigotry. The importance which they still, though less than formerly, attach to dogmatic propositions, does not prevent them from feeling the moral side of their theology. Christianity influences conduct, not indeed half as much as in theory it ought, but probably more than it does in any other modern country, and far more than it did in the so-called ages of faith.

Nor do their moral and religious impulses remain in the soft haze of self-complacent sentiment. The desire to expunge or cure the visible evils of the world is strong. Nowhere are so many philanthropic and reformatory agencies at work. Zeal outruns discretion, outruns the possibilities of the case, in not a few of the efforts made, as well by legislation as by voluntary action, to suppress vice, to prevent intemperance, to purify popular literature.

Religion apart, they are an unreverential people. I do not mean irreverent, — far from it; nor do I mean that they have not a great capacity for hero-worship, as they have many a time shown. I mean that they are little disposed, especially in public questions — political, economical, or social — to defer to the opinions of those who are wiser or better instructed than themselves. Everything tends to make the individual independent and self-reliant. He goes early into the world; he is left to make his way alone; he tries one occupation after another, if the first or second venture does not prosper; he gets to think that each man is his own best helper and adviser. Thus he is led, I will not say to form his own opinions, for even in America few are those who do that, but to fancy that he has formed them, and to feel little need of aid from others towards correcting them. There is therefore, less disposition

than in Europe to expect light and leading on public affairs from speakers or writers. Oratory is not directed towards instruction, but towards stimulation. Special knowledge, which commands deference in applied science or in finance, does not command it in politics, because that is not deemed a special subject, but one within the comprehension of every practical man. Politics is, to be sure, a profession, and so far might seem to need professional aptitudes. But the professional politician is not the man who has studied statesmanship, but the man who has practised the art of running conventions and winning elections.

Even that strong point of America, the completeness and highly popular character of local government, contributes to lower the standard of attainment expected in a public man, because the citizens judge of all politics by the politics they see first and know best, — those of their township or city, — and fancy that he who is fit to be selectman, or county commissioner, or alderman, is fit to sit in the great council of the nation. Like the shepherd in Virgil, they think the only difference between their town and Rome is in its size, and believe that what does for Lafayetteville will do well enough for Washington. Hence when a man of statesmanlike gifts appears, he has little encouragement to take a high and statesmanlike tone, for his words do not necessarily receive weight from his position. He fears to be instructive or hortatory, lest such an attitude should expose him to ridicule; and in America ridicule is a terrible power. Nothing escapes it. Few have the courage to face it. In the indulgence of it even this humane race can be unfeeling.

They are a busy people. I have already observed that the leisured class is relatively small, is in fact confined to a few Eastern cities. The citizen has little time to think about political problems. Engrossing all the working hours, his avocation leaves him only stray moments for this fundamental duty. It is true that he admits his responsibilities, considers himself a member of a party, takes some interest in current events. But although he would reject the idea that his thinking should be done for him, he has not leisure to do it for himself, and must practically lean upon and follow his party. It astonishes an English visitor to find how small a part politics play in

conversation among the wealthier classes and generally in the cities. During a tour of four months in America in the autumn of 1881, in which I had occasion to mingle with all sorts and conditions of men in all parts of the country, and particularly in the Eastern cities, I never once heard American politics discussed except when I or some other European brought the subject on the carpet. In a presidential year, and especially during the months of a presidential campaign, there is, of course, abundance of private talk, as well as of public speaking, but even then the issues raised are largely personal rather than political in the European sense. But at other times the visitor is apt to feel — more, I think, than he feels anywhere in Britain — that his host has been heavily pressed by his own business concerns during the day, and that when the hour of relaxation arrives he gladly turns to lighter and more agreeable topics than the state of the nation. This remark is less applicable to the dwellers in villages. There is plenty of political chat round the store at the cross roads, and though it is rather in the nature of gossip than of debate, it seems, along with the practice of local government, to sustain the interest of ordinary folk in public affairs.[1]

The want of serious and sustained thinking is not confined to politics. One feels it even more as regards economical and social questions. To it must be ascribed the vitality of certain prejudices and fallacies which could scarcely survive the continuous application of such vigorous minds as one finds among the Americans. Their quick perceptions serve them so well in business and in the ordinary affairs of private life that they do not feel the need for minute investigation and patient reflection on the underlying principles of things. They are apt to ignore difficulties, and when they can no longer ignore them they will evade them rather than lay siege to them according to the rules of art. The sense that there is no time to spare haunts an American even when he might find the time, and would do best for himself by finding it.

[1] The European country where the common people best understand politics is Switzerland. That where they talk most about politics is, I think, Greece. I remember, for instance, in crossing the channel which divides Cephalonia from Ithaca, to have heard the boatmen discuss a recent ministerial crisis at Athens, during the whole voyage, with the liveliest interest and apparently some knowledge.

Some one will say that an aversion to steady thinking belongs to the average man everywhere. Admitting this, I must repeat once more that we are now comparing the Americans not with average men in other countries, but with the ideal citizens of a democracy. We are trying them by the standard which the theory of their government assumes. In other countries statesmen or philosophers do, and are expected to do, the solid thinking for the bulk of the people. Here the people are expected to do it for themselves. To say that they do it imperfectly is not to deny them the credit of doing it better than a European philosopher might have predicted.

They are a commercial people, whose point of view is primarily that of persons accustomed to reckon profit and loss. Their impulse is to apply a direct practical test to men and measures, to assume that the men who have got on fastest are the smartest men, and that a scheme which seems to pay well deserves to be supported. Abstract reasonings they dislike, subtle reasonings they suspect; they accept nothing as practical which is not plain, downright, apprehensible by an ordinary understanding. Although open-minded, so far as willingness to listen goes, they are hard to convince, because they have really made up their minds on most subjects, having adopted the prevailing notions of their locality or party as truths due to their own reflection.

It may seem a contradiction to remark that with this shrewdness and the sort of hardness it produces, they are nevertheless an impressionable people. Yet this is true. It is not their intellect, however, that is impressionable, but their imagination and emotions, which respond in unexpected ways to appeals made on behalf of a cause which seems to have about it something noble or pathetic. They are capable of an ideality surpassing that of Englishmen or Frenchmen.

They are an unsettled people. In no State of the Union is the bulk of the population so fixed in its residence as everywhere in Europe; in many it is almost nomadic. Except in some of the stagnant districts of the South, nobody feels rooted to the soil. Here to-day and gone to-morrow, he cannot readily contract habits of trustful dependence on his neighbours. Community of interest, or of belief in such a cause as temperance, or protection for native industry, unites him for a time with

others similarly minded, but congenial spirits seldom live long enough together to form a school or type of local opinion which develops strength and becomes a proselytizing force. Perhaps this tends to prevent the growth of variety in opinion. When a man arises with some power of original thought in politics, he is feeble if isolated, and is depressed by his insignificance, whereas if he grows up in favourable soil with sympathetic minds around him, whom he can in prolonged intercourse permeate with his ideas, he learns to speak with confidence and soars on the wings of his disciples. One who considers the variety of conditions under which men live in America may certainly find ground for surprise that there should be so few independent schools of opinion.

But even while an unsettled, they are nevertheless an associative, because a sympathetic people. Although the atoms are in constant motion, they have a strong attraction for one another. Each man catches his neighbour's sentiment more quickly and easily than happens with the English. That sort of reserve and isolation, that tendency rather to repel than to invite confidence, which foreigners attribute to the Englishman, though it belongs rather to the upper and middle class than to the nation generally, is, though not absent, yet less marked in America.[1] It seems to be one of the notes of difference between the two branches of the race. In the United States, since each man likes to feel that his ideas raise in other minds the same emotions as in his own, a sentiment or impulse is rapidly propagated and quickly conscious of its strength. Add to this the aptitude for organization which their history and institutions have educed, and one sees how the tendency to form and the talent to work combinations for a political or any other object has become one of the great features of the country. Hence, too, the immense strength of party. It rests not only on interest and habit and the sense of its value as a means of working the government, but also on the sympathetic element and instinct of combination ingrained in the national character.

[1] I do not mean that Americans are more apt to unbosom themselves to strangers, but that they have rather more adaptiveness than the English, and are less disposed to stand alone and care nothing for the opinion of others. It is worth noticing that Americans travelling abroad seem to get more easily into touch with the inhabitants of the country than the English do; nor have they the English habit of calling those inhabitants--Frenchmen, for instance, or Germans--"the natives."

They are a changeful people. Not fickle, for they are if anything too tenacious of ideas once adopted, too fast bound by party ties, too willing to pardon the errors of a cherished leader. But they have what chemists call low specific heat; they grow warm suddenly and cool as suddenly; they are liable to swift and vehement outbursts of feeling which rush like wildfire across the country, gaining glow, like the wheel of a railway car, by the accelerated motion. The very similarity of ideas and equality of conditions which makes them hard to convince at first makes a conviction once implanted run its course the more triumphantly. They seem all to take flame at once, because what has told upon one, has told in the same way upon all the rest, and the obstructing and separating barriers which exist in Europe scarcely exist here. Nowhere is the saying so applicable that nothing succeeds like success. The native American or so-called Know-nothing party had in two years from its foundation become a tremendous force, running, and seeming for a time likely to carry, its own presidential candidate. In three years more it was dead without hope of revival. Now and then, as for instance in the elections of 1874–75, and again in those of 1890, there comes a rush of feeling so sudden and tremendous, that the name of Tidal Wave has been invented to describe it.

After this it may seem a paradox to add that the Americans are a conservative people. Yet any one who observes the power of habit among them, the tenacity with which old institutions and usages, legal and theological formulas, have been clung to, will admit the fact. A love for what is old and established is in their English blood. Moreover, prosperity helps to make them conservative. They are satisfied with the world they live in, for they have found it a good world, in which they have grown rich and can sit under their own vine and fig tree, none making them afraid. They are proud of their history and of their Constitution, which has come out of the furnace of civil war with scarcely the smell of fire upon it. It is little to say that they do not seek change for the sake of change, because the nations that do this exist only in the fancy of alarmist philosophers. There are nations, however, whose impatience of existing evils, or whose proneness to be allured by visions of a brighter future, makes them under-estimate the risk of change,

nations that will pull up the plant to see whether it has begun to strike root. This is not the way of the Americans. They are no doubt ready to listen to suggestions from any quarter. They do not consider that an institution is justified by its existence, but admit everything to be matter for criticism. Their keenly competitive spirit and pride in their own ingenuity have made them quicker than any other people to adopt and adapt inventions: telephones were in use in every little town over the West, while in the city of London men were just beginning to wonder whether they could be made to pay. I have remarked in an earlier chapter that the fondness for trying experiments has produced a good deal of hasty legislation, especially in the newer States, and that some of it has already been abandoned. But these admissions do not affect the main proposition. The Americans are at bottom a conservative people, in virtue both of the deep instincts of their race and of that practical shrewdness which recognizes the value of permanence and solidity in institutions. They are conservative in their fundamental beliefs, in the structure of their governments, in their social and domestic usages. They are like a tree whose pendulous shoots quiver and rustle with the lightest breeze, while its roots enfold the rock with a grasp which storms cannot loosen.

CHAPTER LXXXI

CLASSES AS INFLUENCING OPINION

These are some of the characteristics of American opinion in general, and may, if I am right in the description given, be discovered in all classes of the native white population. They exist, however, in different measure in different classes, and the above account of them needs to be supplemented by some remarks on the habits and tendencies of each class. I do not, of course, propose to describe the present opinions of classes, for that would require an account of current political questions: my aim is merely to state such general class characters as go to affect the quality and vigour of opinion. Classes are in America by no means the same thing as in the greater nations of Europe. One must not, for political purposes, divide them as upper and lower, richer and poorer, but rather according to the occupations they respectively follow and the conditions of life that constitute their environment. Their specific characters, as a naturalist would say, are less marked even in typical individuals than would be the case in Europe, and are in many individuals scarcely recognizable. Nevertheless, the differences between one class and another are sufficient to produce distinctly traceable influences on the political opinion of the nation, and to colour the opinions, perhaps even to determine the political attitude, of the district where a particular class predominates.

I begin with the farmers, because they are, if not numerically the largest class, at least the class whose importance is most widely felt. As a rule they are owners of their land; and as a rule the farms are small, running from forty or fifty up to three hundred acres. In a few places, especially in the West, great landowners let farms to tenants, and in some parts of the South one finds large estates cultivated by small tenants, often

negroes. But far more frequently the owner tills the land and the tiller owns it. The proportion of hired labourers to farmers is therefore very much smaller than in England, partly because farms are usually of a size permitting the farmer and his family to do much of the work by themselves, partly because machinery is more extensively used, especially in the level regions of the West. The labourers, or, as they are called, the "hired men," do not, taking the country as a whole, form a social stratum distinct from the farmers, and there is so little distinction in education or rank between them that one may practically treat employer and employed as belonging to the same class.

The farmer is a keener and more enterprising man than in Europe, with more of that commercial character which one observes in Americans, far less anchored to a particular spot, and of course subject to no such influences of territorial magnates as prevail in England, Germany, or Italy. He is so far a business man as sometimes to speculate in grain or bacon. Yet he is not free from the usual defects of agriculturists. He is obstinate, tenacious of his habits, not readily accessible to argument. His way of life is plain and simple, and he prides himself on its simplicity, holding the class he belongs to to be the mainstay of the country, and regarding city-folk and lawyers with a mixture of suspicion and jealousy, because he deems them as inferior to himself in virtue as they are superior in adroitness, and likely to outwit him. Sparing rather than stingy in his outlays, and living mainly on the produce of his own fields, he has so little ready money that small sums appear large to him; and as he fails to see why everybody cannot thrive and be happy on $1500 (£300) a year, he thinks that figure a sufficient salary for a country or district official, and regulates his notions of payment for all other officials, judges included, by the same standard. To belong to a party, and support it by his vote, seems to him part of a citizen's duty, but his interests in national politics are secondary to those he feels in agriculturists' questions, particularly in the great war against monopolies and capitalists, which the power and in some cases the tyranny of the railroad companies has provoked in the West. Naturally a grumbler, as are his brethren everywhere, finding his isolated life dull, and often unable to follow

the causes which depress the price of produce, he is the more easily persuaded that his grievances are due to the combinations of designing speculators. The agricultural newspaper to which he subscribes is of course written up to his prejudices, and its adulation of the farming class confirms his belief that he who makes the wealth of the country is tricked out of his proper share in its prosperity. Thus he now and then makes desperate attempts to right himself by legislation, lending too ready an ear to politicians who promise him redress by measures possibly unjust and usually unwise. In his impatience with the regular parties, he is apt to vote for those who call themselves a People's or Farmer's party, and who dangle before him the hope of getting "cheap money," of reducing the expenses of legal proceedings, and of compelling the railroads to carry his produce at unremunerative rates. However, after all said and done, he is an honest, kindly sort of man, hospitable, religious, patriotic: the man whose hard work has made the West what it is. It is chiefly in the West that one must now look for the well-marked type I have tried to draw, yet not always in the newer West; for, in regions like northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Dakota, the farming population is mainly foreign, — Scandinavian and German, — while the native Americans occupy themselves with trading and railroad management. However, the Scandinavians and Germans acquire in a few years many of the characteristics of the native farmer, and follow the political lead given by the latter. In the early days of the Republic, the agriculturists were, especially in the middle and the newer parts of the Southern States, the backbone of the Democratic party, sturdy supporters of Jefferson, and afterwards of Andrew Jackson. When the opposition of North and South began to develop itself and population grew up beyond the Ohio, the pioneers from New England who settled in that country gave their allegiance to the Whig party; and in the famous "log cabin and hard cider" campaign, which carried the election of General Harrison as President, that worthy, taken as a type of the hardy backwoodsman, made the Western farmer for the first time a noble and poetical figure to the popular imagination. Nowadays he is less romantic, yet still one of the best elements in the country. He stood by the Union during the war, and gave his life freely for it. For

many years afterwards his vote carried the Western, and especially the North-western States for the Republican party, which is to him still the party which saved the Union and protects the negro.

The shopkeepers and small manufacturers may be said to form a second class, though in the smaller towns, of the West especially, their interests are so closely interwoven with those of the cultivators, and their way of life so similar, that there is little special to remark about them. In the larger towns they are sharper and more alive to what is passing than the rural population, but their intellectual horizon is not much wider. A sort of natural selection carries the more ambitious and eager spirits into the towns, for the native American dislikes the monotony and isolation of a farm life with its slender prospect of wealth. To keep a store in a "corner lot" is the ambition of the keen-witted lad. The American shopkeeper, it need hardly be said, has not the obsequiousness of his European congener, and is far from fancying that retail trade has anything degrading about it. He is apt to take more part in local politics than the farmer, but less apt to become a member of a State legislature, because he can seldom leave his store as the farmer can at certain seasons leave his land. He reads more newspapers than the farmer does, and of course learns more from current talk. His education has been better, because city schools are superior to country ones. He is perhaps not so certain to go solid for his party. He has less ground of quarrel with the railroads, but if connected with a manufacturing industry, is of course more likely to be interested in tariff questions, or, in other words, to be a Protectionist. His occupation, however, seldom gives him any direct personal motive for supporting one party more than another, and he has less of that political timidity which Europeans take to be the note of the typical bourgeois than the retail dealer of France or England.

The working men, by which I mean those who toil with their hands for wages, form a less well-marked class than is the case in most parts of Europe, and have not so many subclasses within their own body, though of course the distinction between skilled and unskilled labour makes itself felt, and one may say, speaking generally, that all unskilled labourers are

comparatively recent immigrants. The native work-people are of course fairly educated; they read the daily newspapers, and very likely a weekly religious journal and a monthly magazine; many of them, I think a majority, except in the greater cities, belong to a congregation in whose concerns they are generally interested. Many are total abstainers. Their wives have probably had a longer schooling and read more widely than they do themselves. In the smaller towns both in New England and the West, and even in some of the large cities, such as Philadelphia and Chicago, the better part of them own the houses they live in, wooden houses in the suburbs with a little verandah and a bit of garden, and thus feel themselves to have a stake in the country. Their wives and daughters dress with so much taste that on Sunday, or when you meet them in the steam cars, you would take them for persons in easy circumstances. Until lately, strikes have been less frequent than in England, nor, in spite of the troubles of recent years, has there hitherto existed any general sense of hostility to employers. This is due partly to the better circumstances of the workmen, partly to the fact that the passage from the one class to the other is easy and frequent. Thus, notwithstanding the existence of so-called Labour parties, and the recent creation of a vast organization embracing all trades over the whole Union (the Knights of Labour), there has hitherto been less of collective class feeling and class action among workmen than in England,[1] certainly much less than in France or Germany. Politicians have of late years begun to pose as the special friends of the working man. Although in a country where the popular vote is omnipotent there seems something absurd in assuming that the working man is weak and stands in need of special protection, still the great power of capital, the illegitimate means by which that power acts upon legislatures, the growing disparities of fortune, and the fact that rich men bear less than their due share of taxation, have furnished a basis for labour agitation. While contributing as

[1] An experienced American friend writes me: "Although immigrants from Great Britain are the best of all our immigrants, English workmen are more apt to stir up trouble with their employers than those of any other race. Employers say that they fear their English workmen, because they are generally suspicious, and disbelieve in the possibility of anything but hostility between men and masters."

many recruits to the army of professional politicians as do the other classes, the wage-earning class is no more active in political work than they are, and furnishes few candidates for State or Federal office. Till recently little demand was made for the representation of labour as labour either in Congress or in State legislatures. There are of course many members who have begun life as operatives; but, so far as I know, very few in Congress (though some in the State legislatures) whose special function or claim it is to be the advocates of their whilom class. Such progress as communistic or socialistic movements have made has been chiefly among the immigrants from Central Europe, Germans and Slavs, with a much smaller contingent of Irish and Italian support, but it is not easy to say how great this progress is, for the educated classes had known and cared very little about it until the outbreak of Anarchist violence at Chicago in 1886 turned all eyes upon a new source of peril to civilization. One question, however, which never fails to excite the workmen, both natives and immigrants, is the introduction of cheap foreign labour, and the bringing in of workmen to fill the place of strikers. A law passed some years ago, in the enforcement of which considerable difficulties have arisen, forbids the landing in the country of persons coming under a contract to work. In the Pacific States the feeling against the Chinese, who take lower wages, often one-half of what whites obtain, has not merely been the prime factor in Californian State politics, but has induced the Senate to ratify treaties and Congress to pass Acts, the last one extremely stringent, forbidding their entry. When a shoe manufacturer in Massachusetts some years ago brought a number of Chinese to replace his own men who had gone out on strike, they were threatened with molestation. One trade, however, the Chinese are permitted to follow, and have now almost monopolized, that of washermen — one cannot say, washerwomen. Even a small city rarely wants its Chinese laundry.

It will be gathered from what I have said that there is no want of intelligence or acuteness among the working people. For political purposes, and setting apart what are specifically called labour questions, there is really little difference between them and other classes. Their lights are as good as those of farmers or traders, their modes of thinking similar. They are

owever, somewhat more excitable and more easily fascinated y a vigorous demagogue, as the success of General Benjamin . Butler among the shoemakers of his Massachusetts district roved. A powerful speaker with a flow of humour and udacity will go farther with them than with the more comercially-minded shopkeeper, or the more stolid agriculturist, f indeed one can call any American stolid.

The ignorant masses of such great cities as New York, Cincinati, Chicago, San Francisco, together with the dangerously large tramp" class, are hardly to be reckoned with the working class have been describing, but answer better to what is called in England "the residuum." They are largely Irish and Germans, ogether with Poles, Czechs, and Russians, negroes, Frenchmen, talians, and such native Americans as have fallen from their irst estate into drink and penury. From the more recent immigrants neither national patriotism nor a sense of civic duty an as yet be expected; the pity is that they have been allowed ivic power. Political opinions they can hardly be said to possess, for they have not had time to learn to know the institutions of their new country. Yet there are three sentiments which guide them, besides adhesion to the party which snapped hem up when they landed, or which manipulates them by eaders of their own race. One of these sentiments is religious ympathy. Such of them as are Roman Catholics are ready to tand by whichever party may obtain the favour, or be readiest o serve the interests, of their church.[1] Another is the protection f the liquor traffic. The German loves his beer, and deems a and where this most familiar of pleasures is unattainable no and of freedom, while the Irishman stands by a trade in which is countrymen are largely engaged. And, thirdly, the American-Irish have been largely swayed by hatred of England, which has made them desire to annoy her, and if possible to tir up a quarrel between her and the land of their adoption. The events of the last few years in England seem, so far as one an gather, to have lessened this feeling, on which, of course, nscrupulous politicians play, and which is the only remaining bstacle to a good understanding between the two countries.

[1] Those of the German immigrants who remain in the great cities instead of oing West, seem to be mostly Catholics, at least in name; as are also the oles, Czechs, and Slovaks.

The European reader must not suppose that this lowest se tion of the labouring class is wholly composed of immigrant nor that all of the city-dwelling immigrants belong to it, fo there are many foreigners whose education and skill place the at once on a level with the native American workmen. It importance in politics arises less from its number, which do not approach three million of voters all told,[1] than from th cohesion, in every great city, of so much of it as is masse there. Being comparatively ignorant, and for the most pa not yet absorbed into the American population, it is not move by the ordinary political forces, nor amenable to the ordinar intellectual and moral influences, but "goes solid" as its leade direct it, a fact which gives these leaders exceptional weigh and may enable them, when parties are nearly balanced, t dictate their terms to statesmen. The disposition to truckl to the forces of disorder, and to misuse the power of pardonin offenders, which prominent State officials sometimes evince, due to the fear of the so-called "Labour Vote," a vote whic would be insignificant were the suffrage restricted to perso who have resided fifteen or twenty years in the countr Nevertheless the immigrants are not so largely answerab for the faults of American politics as a stranger might be le by the language of many Americans to believe. There is disposition in the United States to use them, and especiall the Irish, much as the cat is used in the kitchen to account f broken plates and food which disappears. The cities have n doubt suffered from the immigrant vote. But New York wa not an Eden before the Irish came; and would not become a Eden were they all to return to green Erin, or move on to ar Arizona.

The capitalist class consists of large merchants, manufa turers, bankers, and railroad men, with a few great land spec lators and directors of trading or carrying companies. Ho much capacity and energy, how much wealth and influen there is in this small class everybody knows. It includes th best executive ability of the country, and far more abili

[1] The total foreign-born population of the United States, of both sexes, w (in 1890) 9,249,547 as against 52,372,703 native born. Of the lower labouri class I am describing, a very small part is native American and another co siderable part the American-born sons of recent immigrants.

han is devoted to the public service of the State. Though uch persons do not, and hardly could, hold aloof from politics —some of them are indeed zealous party men — their interest es chiefly in using politics for their own purposes, and espe- ially in resisting the attacks with which they are threatened, ometimes by the popular movement against monopolists and reat corporations, sometimes by Free Traders anxious to get d of the present high tariff which the manufacturers deem ssential to the welfare of the country. One-half of the capital- ts are occupied in preaching *laissez faire* as regards railroad ntrol, the other half in resisting it in railroad rate matters, in der to have their goods carried more cheaply, and in tariff atters, in order to protect industries threatened with foreign mpetition. Yet they manage to hold well together. Their ractical talent does not necessarily imply political insight, any ore than moral elevation, nor have they generally the taste or isure to think seriously about the needs of the State. In no untry does one find so many men of eminent capacity for siness, shrewd, forcible, and daring, who are so uninteresting, intellectually barren, outside the sphere of their business nowledge.

But the wealthy have many ways of influencing opinion and e course of events. Some of them own, others find means inspiring, newspapers. Many are liberal supporters of uni- rsities and colleges, and it is alleged that they occasionally scourage the promulgation, by college teachers, of opinions ey dislike. Presidents of great corporations have armies of ficials under their orders, who cannot indeed be intimidated, r public opinion would resent that, yet may be suffered to now what their superior thinks and expects. Cities, districts country, even States or Territories, have much to hope or ar from the management of a railway, and good reason to nciliate its president. Moreover, as the finance of the untry is in the hands of these men and every trader is fected by financial changes, as they control enormous joint- ock enterprises whose shares are held and speculated in by sts of private persons of all ranks, their policy and utter- ces are watched with anxious curiosity, and the line they ke determines the conduct of thousands not directly con- cted with them. A word from several of the great financiers

would go a long way with leading statesmen. They are fo the most part a steadying influence in politics, being opposed to sudden changes which might disturb the money market o depress trade, and especially opposed to complications with foreign States. They are therefore *par excellence* the peac party in America, for though some might like to fish i troubled waters, the majority would have far more to los than to gain.

There remains the group of classes loosely called professiona men, of whom we may dismiss the physicians as neither bring ing any distinctive element into politics, nor often taking a active interest therein, and the journalists, because they hav been considered in treating of the organs of opinion, and th clergy as, inhibited by public feeling from direct immixture i political strife. In the anti-slavery and Free Soil struggles ministers of religion were prominent, as they are now in th temperance movement, and indeed will always be when distinctly moral issue is placed before the country. But i ordinary times, and as regards most questions, they find i prudent to rest content with inculcating such sound principle as will elevate their hearers' views and lead them to vote fo the best men. Some few, however, of exceptional zeal o unusually well-assured position do appear on political pla forms, and, like the late Mr. Henry Ward Beecher, justif their courage by their success. The Roman Catholic prelate have great influence with their flocks, but are so sensible of th displeasure which its exercise would cause among the nativ Americans as to be guarded in political action, allowing them selves a freer hand in promoting temperance or other mora causes. Some of them have been among the most prominen figures in the country.

The lawyers, who are both barristers and attorneys in on there being no such distinction of the profession into tw branches as exists in Britain and France, are of all classes tha which has most to do with politics.[1] From their ranks come a large part, probably a half, and apparently the better half, o the professional politicians. Those who do not make politic a business have usually something to do with it, and even thos who have little to do with it enjoy opportunities of lookin

[1] An account of the American Bar will be found in a later chapter.

behind the scenes. The necessities of their practice oblige them to study the Federal Constitution and the Constitution of their own State, as well as to watch current legislation. It is therefore from the legal profession that most of the leading statesmen have been drawn, from the days of Patrick Henry, John Jay, and John Adams down to those of Abraham Lincoln and the presidential candidates of our own generation. Hence both in great cities and in small ones the lawyer is favourably placed for influencing opinion. If he be a man of parts, he is apt to be the centre of local opinion, as Lincoln was in Springfield, where he practised law and made his reputation.[1] When in some great community, like New York or Boston, a demonstration is organized, some distinguished advocate, such as Charles O'Conor was in New York, such as Rufus Choate was in Boston, is selected for the oration of the day, because he has the power of speech, and because everybody knows him. Thus the lawyers best deserve to be called the leading class, less powerful in proportion to their numbers than the capitalists, but more powerful as a whole, since more numerous and more locally active. Of course it is only on a very few professional questions that they act together as a class. Their function is to educate opinion from the technical side, and to put things in a telling way before the people. Whether the individual lawyer is or is not a better citizen than his neighbours, he is likely to be a shrewder one, knowing more about government and public business than most of them do, and able at least to perceive the mischiefs of bad legislation, which farmers or shopkeepers may faintly realize. Thus on the whole the influence of the profession makes for good, and though it is often the instrument by which harm is wrought, it is more often the means of revealing and defeating the tricks of politicians, and of keeping the wholesome principles of the Constitution before the eyes of the nation. Its action in political life may be compared with its function in judicial proceedings. Advocacy is at the service of the just and the unjust equally, and sometimes makes the worse appear the better cause, yet experience shows that the sifting of evi-

[1] I have heard townsmen of the great President describe how the front of his house used to be a sort of gathering place on summer evenings where his racy talk helped to mould the opinion of the place.

dence and the arguing of points of law tend on the whole to make justice prevail.

There remain the men of letters and artists, an extremely small class outside a few Eastern cities, and the teachers, especially those in colleges and universities. The influence of literary men has been more felt through magazines than through books, for native authorship suffered severely till 1891 from the deluge of cheap English reprints. That of the teachers tells primarily on their pupils, and indirectly on the circles to which those pupils belong, or in which they work when they have left college. One is amused by the bitterness — affected scorn trying to disguise real fear — with which "college professors" are denounced by the professional politicians as unpractical, visionary, pharisaical, "kid-gloved," "high-toned," "un-American," the fact being that an impulse towards the improvement of party methods, civil service reform and tariff reform, has come from the universities, and been felt in the increased political activity of the better educated youth. The new generation of lawyers, clergymen, and journalists, of teachers in the higher schools, and indeed of business men also, so far as they receive a university education, have been inspired by the universities, particularly of course by the older and more highly developed institutions of the Eastern States, with a more serious and earnest view of politics than has prevailed among the richer classes since the strain of the Civil War passed away. Their horizon has been enlarged, their patriotism tempered by a sense of national shortcomings, and quickened by a higher ideal of national well being. The confidence that all other prosperity will accompany material prosperity, the belief that good instincts are enough to guide nations through practical difficulties, error which led astray so many worthy people in the last generation, are being dispelled, and a juster view of the great problems of democratic government presented. The seats of learning and education are at present among the most potent forces making for progress and the formation of sound opinion in the United States, and they increase daily in the excellence of their teachers no less than in the number of their students.

Before quitting this part of the subject a few general obse

vations are needed to supplement or sum up the results of the foregoing inquiry.

There is in the United States no such general opposition as in continental Europe of upper and lower classes, richer and poorer classes. There is no such jealousy or hostility as one finds in France between the bourgeoisie and the operatives. In many places class distinctions do exist for the purposes of social intercourse. But it is only in the larger cities that the line is sharply drawn between those who call themselves gentlemen and those others to whom, in talk among themselves, the former set would refuse this epithet.

There is no one class or set of men whose special function it is to form and lead opinion. The politicians certainly do not. Public opinion leads them.

Still less is there any governing class. The class whence most office-holders come corresponds, as respects education and refinement, to what would be called the lower middle class in Europe. But office-holders are not governors.

Such class issues as now exist or have recently existed, seldom, or to a small extent, coincide with party issues. They are usually toyed with by both parties alike, or if such a question becomes strong enough to be made the basis of a new party, that party will usually stand by itself apart from the two old and regular organizations.

In Europe, classes have become factors in politics either from interest or from passion. Legislation or administration may have pressed hardly on a class, and the class has sought to defend and emancipate itself. Or its feelings may have been wounded by past injury or insult, and it may seek occasions for revenge. In America neither cause for the action of any class as a class can be said to exist.[1] Hence classes have not been prime factors in American politics or in the formation of native political opinion. In the main, political questions proper have held the first place in a voter's mind, and ques-

[1] Even those who would persuade the working men that legislation is unjust to them seldom complain of what it does, but rather of what it omits or does not prevent. Any statute which bore harshly on labouring men would in America be repealed forthwith. There is at present in some States an agitation, conducted by "Labour" leaders, to alter the law which restrains what is called coercive "picketing" or molestation in trade disputes, but the laws have so far been upheld by the general sense of the community.

tions affecting his class the second.[1] The great strikes which have of late years convulsed large sections of the country, and the "labour" agitation which has accompanied them, have brought new elements of class passion and class interest upon the scene. But it is possible that these phenomena, which are mainly due to the presence of a mass of immigrants, still unassimilated, though invested with political power, may prove to be transitory.

The nation is not an aggregate of classes. They exist within it, but they do not make it up. You are not struck by their political significance as you would be in any European country. The people is one people, although it occupies a wider territory than any other nation, and is composed of elements from many quarters.

Even education makes less difference between various sections of the community than might be expected. One finds among the better instructed many of those prejudices and fallacies to which the European middle classes are supposed peculiarly liable. Among the less instructed of the native Americans, on the other hand, there is a comprehension of public affairs, a shrewdness of judgment, and a generally diffused interest in national welfare, exceeding that of the humbler classes in Europe.

This is a strong point of the nation. This is what has given buoyancy to the vessel of the State, and enabled her to carry with apparent, though perhaps with diminishing, ease the dead weight of ignorance which European emigration continues to throw upon her decks.

[1] There are exceptions — *e.g.* tariff questions are foremost in the mind of manufacturers, Chinese questions in those of Californian working men, transportation questions often in those of farmers.

CHAPTER LXXXII

LOCAL TYPES OF OPINION — EAST, WEST, AND SOUTH

Both the general tendencies and the class tendencies in the development of public opinion which I have attempted to sketch, may be observed all over the vast area of the Union. Some, however, are more powerful in one region, others in another, while the local needs and feelings of each region tend to give a particular colour to its views and direction to its aims. One must therefore inquire into and endeavour to describe these local differences, so as, by duly allowing for them, to correct what has been stated generally with regard to the conditions under which opinion is formed, and the questions which evoke it.

In an earlier chapter I have classified the States into five groups, the North-Eastern or New England States, the Middle States, the North-Western States, the Southern States, and the States of the Pacific Slope. For the purposes of our present inquiry there is no material difference between the first two of these groups, but the differences between the others are significant. It is needless to add that there are, of course, abundance of local differences within these divisions. Pennsylvania, for instance, is for many purposes unlike Ohio. Georgia stands on a higher level than Louisiana. Nebraska is more raw than Illinois. To go into these minor points of divergence would involve a tedious discussion, and perhaps confuse the reader after all, so he must be asked to understand that this chapter endeavours to present only the general aspect which opinion wears in each section of the country, and that what is said of a section generally, is not meant to be taken as equally applicable to every State within it.

In the Eastern States the predominant influence is that of capitalists, manufacturers, merchants — in a word, of the com-

mercial classes. The East finds the capital for great undertakings all over the country, particularly for the making of railroads, the stock of which is chiefly held by Eastern investors, and the presidents whereof often have their central office in New York, Boston, or Philadelphia, though the line may traverse the Western or Southern States. The East also conducts the gigantic trade with Europe. It ships the grain and the cattle, the pork and the petroleum, it "finances" the shipping of much of the cotton, it receives nearly all the manufactured goods that Europe sends, as well as the emigrants from Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia.[1] The arms of its great bankers and merchants stretch over the whole Union, making those commercial influences which rule in their own seat potent everywhere. Eastern opinion is therefore the most quickly and delicately sensitive to financial movements and European influences, as well as the most firmly bound to a pacific policy. As in the beginning of the century, trade interests made Massachusetts and Connecticut anxious to avoid a breach with England, to whose ports their vessels plied, so now, though the shipping which enters Eastern ports is chiefly European (British, Norwegian, German, French), the mercantile connections of American and European merchants and financiers are so close that an alarm of war might produce widespread disaster.

The East is also, being the oldest, the best educated and most intelligent quarter of the country.[2] Not only does it contain more men of high culture, but the average of knowledge and thought (excluding the mob of the great cities and some backward districts in the hills of Pennsylvania) is higher than elsewhere. Its literary men and eminent teachers labour for the whole country, and its cities, which show the lowest element of the population in their rabble, show also the largest number of men of light and leading in all professions. Although very able newspapers are published in the West as well as in the East, still the tone of Eastern political discussion is more generally dignified and serious than in the rest of

[1] Some Germans and Italians enter by New Orleans or the ports of Texas.

[2] The percentage of persons able to read and write is as high in some of the Western States, such as Iowa and Nebraska, as in New England, but this may be because the Irish and French Canadians depress the level of New England

he Union. The influences of Europe, which, of course, play irst and chiefly upon the East, are, so far as they affect man-ners and morality, by no means an unmixed good. But in the ealm of thought Europe and its criticism are a stimulative orce, which corrects any undue appreciation of national vir-ues, and helps forward sound views in economics and history. The leisured and well-read class to be found in some Eastern ities is as cosmopolitan in tone as can be found anywhere in he world, yet has not lost the piquancy of its native soil. Its hought appropriates what is fresh and sound in the literature or scientific work of Germany, England, and France more eadily than any of those countries seems to learn from each f the others. These causes, added to the fact that the per-ersions of party government have been unusually gross among he irresponsible masses that crowd these very cities, has oused a more strenuous opposition to the so-called "machine" han in other parts of the country. The Eastern voter is less ound to his party, more accustomed to think for himself, and o look for light, when he feels his own knowledge defective, o capable publicists. When, either in Federal or State or city olitics, an independent party arises, repudiating the bad ominations of one or both of the regular organizations, it is ere that it finds its leaders and the greatest part of its sup-ort. There is also in New England a good deal left of the pirit of Puritanism, cold and keen as glacier air, with its high tandard of public duty and private honour, its disposition to pply the maxims of religion to the conduct of life, its sense, nuch needed in this tender-hearted country, that there are imes when Agag must be hewn in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal. If the people of New England and rural New York ad been left unpolluted by the turbid flood of foreign immi-ration, they would be the fittest of any in the world for a emocratic government. Evils there would still be, as in all overnments, but incomparably less grave than those which ow tax the patriotism of the men who from these States hold p the banner of reform for the whole Union.

It is impossible to draw a line between the East and the Vest, because the boundary is always moving westward. hirty years ago Ohio was typically western in character, now has as much in common with Connecticut or New York as

with Kansas or Minnesota. The most distinctive elements in the Western States are the farming class, which here attains its greatest strength, and the masses of newly-arrived Germans and Scandinavians, who fill whole districts, often outnumbering the native Americans. These immigrants contribute so much more largely to the voting than to the thinking power of the newer States, that their presence is one of the main reasons why the political power of the West exceeds its political capacity. They are honest, industrious, and worthy people, the parents of good American citizens, useful men to clear the woods and break up the prairie, but they know so little of the institutions of the country, and often so little of its language, that they are as clay in the hands of their leaders, sometimes Americans, sometimes men of their own race. The predominance of the agricultural interest has the faults and merits indicated in the account already given of the farming class. Western opinion is politically unenlightened, and not anxious to be enlightened. It dislikes theory, and holds the practical man to be the man who, while discerning keenly his own interest, discerns nothing else beyond the end of his nose. It goes heartily into a party fight, despising Independents, Mugwumps, and "bolters" of all sorts. It has boundless confidence in the future of the country, of the West in particular, of its own State above all, caring not much for what the East thinks, and still less for the judgment of Europe. It feels sure everything will come right, and thinks "cheap transportation" to be the one thing needful. Reckless in enterprises, it is stingy in paying its officials, judges included: good-natured and indulgent to a fault, it is nevertheless displeased to hear that its senator lives in luxury at Washington. Its townsfolk are so much occupied in pushing their towns, between whose newspapers there is a furious rivalry — they hate one another as Athens hated Thebes, or Florence Pisa — its rich men in opening up railroads, its farmers in their household and field toil, labour being scarce and dear, that politics are left to the politicians, who, however, are not the worst specimens of their class. When election time comes the Western man shouts with all his lungs, and should ever another war break out, the West would again send down its stout-hearted large-limbed regiments. While things are as they are now, you cannot ge

the average Western man to listen to philosophical reasonings, or trouble himself about coming dangers. To arrest him you must touch his sentiment, and at this moment the questions whose solution presses are questions which sentiment goes no way to solve.

The West may be called the most distinctively American part of America, because the points in which it differs from the East are the points in which America as a whole differs from Europe. But the character of its population differs in different regions, according to the parts of the country from which the early settlers came. Now the settlers have generally moved along parallels of latitude, and we have therefore the curious result that the characteristics of the older States have propagated themselves westward in parallel lines, so that he who travels from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains will find fewer differences to note than he who, starting from Texas, travels north to Manitoba. Thus northern Ohio was filled from New England and western New York, and in its turn colonized northern Illinois, Michigan, and much of the farther North-west. Southern Ohio and Illinois, together with great part of Indiana, were peopled from Virginia and Kentucky, and the different quality of these early settlers is still traceable. Missouri was colonized from the Slave States, and retains the taint to this day.[1] Kansas, however, though it lies west of Missouri, received in the days of the Free Soil struggle many Puritan immigrants from the Free States, and bears, though it is often called the State of "cranks," a somewhat higher stamp than its neighbour. The Scandinavians are chiefly in Wisconsin and Minnesota, the Germans numerous in Iowa also, and indeed all over these newer States, including Texas. So far back as 1870 Milwaukee was a German rather than an American city;[2] and in 1890 it appeared that there were townships in Wisconsin in which the tax lists had

[1] In Oregon there is a district which was settled by people from Kentucky and Tennessee, rather exceptionally, for the outflow of these States seldom moved so far to the north. The descendants of these immigrants are now less prosperous and enterprising than are those of the men who came from the Free States.

[2] Asking my way about the streets, I found German more helpful than English. In the same year it was noticeable that in Wisconsin the paper money (then alone in use) had got a marked smell from the use of skins and furs by the newly-arrived Swedes and Norwegians.

LIBRARY

for years been kept in German, and counties in which a paid interpreter was required to enable the business of the courts to be transacted. The Territories which lie farther to the South-west have no vote in presidential elections, and only a voteless delegate each in Congress, yet over them the network of party organization has been spread, though, of course, the sparser population feeds a feebler political life.

The Pacific Slope, as its inhabitants call it, geographically includes the States of Oregon and Washington, but Oregon and Washington resemble the North-western States in so many respects that they may better be classed therewith. California and Nevada on the other hand are distinctly peculiar. They are more Western than the States I have just been describing, with the characteristics of those States intensified and some new features added. They are cut off by deserts and barren mountain ranges from the agricultural part of the Mississippi basin, nor is population ever likely to become really continuous across this wilderness. Mining industries play a larger part in them than in any other State, except Colorado. Their inhabitants are unsettled and fluctuating, highly speculative, as one may expect those who mine and gamble in mining stocks to be, occupied with questions of their own, and comparatively indifferent to those which interest the rest of the country. Of these questions, one is Chinese immigration, another the management of the great Central and Southern Pacific railroad system, which is accused of oppressing the trade and industries of California; a third, the reconcilement of the claims of miners and agriculturists to the waters of the rivers, which each set seeks to appropriate, and which the former have asserted the right to foul. But as the recent history of California deserves a chapter to itself, it is enough to observe that public opinion is here, in spite of the proverbial shrewdness, energy, and hardihood of the men of the Pacific, more fitful and gusty, less amenable to the voice of sober reason, and less deferential to the authority of statesmen, or even of party than anywhere else in the Union. "Interests," such as those of a great mine-owning group, or of a railroad, are immensely powerful, and the reactions against them not less so.

Of the South, the solid South, as it is often called, because

its presidential vote is now cast entirely for the Democrats, some account will be found in two later chapters, one sketching its history since the war ended, the other describing the condition of the negro and his relations to the whites. Here, therefore, I will speak only of the general character of political opinion and action in the former Slave States. The phenomena they present are unexampled. Equality before the law is absolute and perfect, being secured by the Federal Constitution. Yet the political subjection of a large part (in some States a majority) of the population is no less complete.

There are three orders of men in the South.

The first is the upper or educated class, including the children of the planting aristocracy which ruled before the Civil War, together with the Northern men who have since 1865 settled in the towns for the purposes of trade or manufacture. Of this order more than nine-tenths — those in fact who have survived from the old aristocracy, together with those who have since risen from the humbler class, and with most of the newer arrivals — belong to the Democratic party. Along with the high spirit and self-confidence which are proper to a ruling race, these Southern men have shown an enlargement of view and an aptitude for grasping decided and continuous lines of policy, in fact a turn for statesmanship as contrasted with mere politics, which was less common in the North, because less favoured by the conditions under which ambition has in the North to push its way. The Southern man who enters public life has had a more assured position than his rival from a Northern State, because he represented the opinion of a united body who stood by him, regarding him as their champion, and who expected from him less subservience to their instructions. He did not need to court so assiduously the breath of popular favour. He was not more educated or intelligent: and had lived in a less stimulating atmosphere. But he had courage and a clear vision of his objects, the two gifts essential for a statesman; while the united popular impulse behind him supplied a sort of second patriotism. The element of gain entered somewhat less into Southern politics, partly because the country is poor: and though the South begins to be commercialized, the sensitiveness on the "point of honour" and a flavour of punctiliousness in manners, recall the olden time.

Opinion in the Slave States before the war, in spite of the divisions between Democrats and Whigs, was generally bold, definite, and consistent, because based on a few doctrines. It was the opinion of a small class who were largely occupied with public affairs, and fond of debating them upon first principles and the words of the Federal Constitution. It has preserved this quality while losing its old fierceness and better recognizing the conditions under which it must work in a Federal republic. On the other hand, the extreme strength of party feeling, due to the extreme sensitiveness regarding the negro, has prevented the growth of independent opinion, and of the tendency which in the North is called Mugwumpism. And although the leading statesmen are not inferior to those whom the North sends to Washington, the total number of thoughtful and enlightened men is, in proportion to the population, smaller than in the North-east, smaller even than in such Western States as Illinois or Ohio.

I have used the past tense in describing these phenomena, because the South is changing, and the process is now scarcely swifter in the West than in those parts of Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama where the coal and iron deposits are being opened up. Most parts, however, are still thinly settled by whites, and so poor that a traveller finds it hard to understand how, when still poorer, the people managed to resist for four years the armies of the wealthy and populous North. There is therefore less eagerness and hopefulness than in the West, less searching discussion and elaborate organization than in the East, less of everything that is characteristically democratic. The Machine has been brought to no such terrible perfection as in the Northern States, because the need of it is not felt where one party is sure of victory, and because talent or social position usually designated the men to be selected as candidates, or the men whose voice would determine the selection. Of late years, however, the aristocratic element in Southern politics has grown weaker, and merits that were deemed characteristic of Southern statesmen are more rarely seen.

The second order consists of those who used to be called the Mean Whites. Their condition strengthens the impression of half civilization which the rural districts of the South produce

upon the traveller, and which comes painfully home to him in the badness of the inns. While slavery lasted, these whites were, in the lowlands of the planting States, a wretched, because economically superfluous, class. There was no room for them as labourers, since the slaves did the work on the plantations; they had not the money to purchase land and machinery for themselves, nor the spirit to push their way in the towns, while the system of large slave-worked properties made, as the *latifundia* did long ago in Italy, the cultivation of small farms hopeless, and the existence of a thriving free peasantry impossible. The planters disliked this class and kept them off their estates as much as possible; the slaves despised them, and called them "poor white trash." In South Carolina and the Gulf States, they picked up a wretched livelihood by raising some vegetables near their huts, and killing the wild creatures of the woods, while a few hung round the great houses to look out for a stray job. Shiftless, ignorant, improvident, with no aims in the present nor hopes for the future, citizens in nothing but the possession of votes, they were a standing reproach to the system that produced them, and the most convincing proof of its economic as well as moral failure. In the northerly Slave States, they were better off, and in the highlands of Western Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina, where there were few or no slaves, they had, along with much rudeness and ignorance, the virtues of simple mountaineers. Their progress since the war has been marked, both near the mining and manufacturing towns, which give work and furnish markets, and in the cotton-bearing uplands, where many have acquired farms and prospered as tillers of the soil. Everywhere, however, they remain, in point of education and enlightenment, behind the small farmers or artisans of the North and West. Before the war they followed, as a matter of course (except in the mountains, where the conditions were different), the lead of the planting class, not more out of deference to it than from aversion to the negroes. The less a man had to be proud of, the more proud was he of his colour. Since the war, they have been no less anxious than their richer neighbours to exclude the negroes from any share in the government. But they are no longer mere followers. They have begun to think and act for themselves; and, though one of the

first signs of independence has been shown in the acceptance of such impracticable projects as those advocated by the Farmers' Alliance, they have become a body which has views, and with whose views it is necessary to reckon.

The negroes constitute about one-third of the population of the old Slave States, and in three States they are in a majority. Though their presence is the dominant factor in Southern politics, they cannot be said to form or influence opinion; and it is not their votes, but the efforts made to prevent them from voting that influence the course of events. I reserve for a special chapter an account of their singular position.

Remembering that of the whole population of the Union, nearly one-third is in the Southern States, and that the majority of that one-third, viz. the lower part of the poor whites and nearly all the negroes (more than one-sixth of the sixty-six millions), has no political knowledge or capacity, nothing that can be called rational opinion, it will be seen how far the inhabitants of the United States are from being a democracy enlightened through and through. If one part of the people is as educated and capable as that of Switzerland, another is as ignorant and politically untrained as that of Russia.

Of the four divisions of the country above described, the West (including Oregon and Washington) has already the largest vote, and since it grows faster than the others, will soon be indisputably predominant. But as it grows, it loses some of its distinctive features, becoming more like the East and falling more and more under Eastern influences, both intellectual and financial. It must not therefore be supposed that what is now typically Western opinion will be the reigning opinion of the future. The Pacific States will in time be drawn closer to those of the Mississippi Valley, losing something of such specific quality as they still possess; and centres of literary activity, such as now exist almost exclusively in the Atlantic States, will be scattered over the whole country. Opinion will therefore be more homogeneous, or at least less local, in the future than it has been in the past; even as now it is less determined by local and State influences than it was in the earlier days of the Republic.

CHAPTER LXXXIII

THE ACTION OF PUBLIC OPINION

The last few chapters have attempted to explain what are the conditions under which opinion is formed in America, what national qualities it reflects, how it is affected by class interests or local circumstances, as well as through what organs it manifests itself. We must now inquire how it acts, and for this purpose try to answer three questions.

By whom is public opinion formed? *i.e.* by the few or by the many?

How does it seek to grasp and use the legal machinery which the Constitutions (Federal and State) provide?

What means has it of influencing the conduct of affairs otherwise than through the regular legal machinery?

It may serve to illustrate the phenomena which mark the growth of opinion in America if we compare them with those of some European country. As Britain is the country in which public opinion has been longest and with least interruption installed in power, and in which the mass of the people are more largely than elsewhere interested in public affairs,[1] Britain supplies the fittest materials for a comparison.

In Britain political supremacy belongs to the householder voters, who number (over the whole United Kingdom) 6,161,000, being rather less than two-thirds of the adult male population. Public opinion ought in theory to reside in them. Practically, however, as everybody knows, most of them have little that can be called political opinion. It is the creation and possession of a much smaller number.

An analysis of public opinion in Britain will distinguish three sets of persons — I do not call them classes, for they do

[1] Always excepting Switzerland, Norway, and Greece, whose conditions are, however, too dissimilar from those of America to make a comparison profitable.

not coincide with social grades — those who make opinion, those who receive and hold opinion, those who have no opinions at all.

The first set consists of practical politicians (*i.e.* a certain number of members of the Lower House and a much smaller fraction of the Upper, together with men taking an active part in local party organizations), journalists and other public writers, and a small fringe of other persons, chiefly professional men, who think and talk constantly about public affairs. Within this set of men, who are to be counted by hundreds rather than by thousands, it is the chiefs of the great parties who have the main share in starting opinion, the journalists in propagating it. Debates in Parliament do something, and the speeches which custom, recent, but strong and increasing, requires the leaders to deliver up and down the country, and which are of course reported, replace Parliament when it is not sitting. The function of the dozen best thinkers and talkers in each party is now not merely, as in the last generation, to know and manage Parliament, to watch foreign affairs, and prepare schemes of domestic legislation, but to inspire, instruct, stimulate, and attach the outside public. So too members of the Houses of Parliament find that the chief utility of their position lies in its enabling them to understand the actualities of politics better than they could otherwise do, and to gain a hearing outside for what they may have to say to their fellow-countrymen. This small set of persons constitutes what may be called the working staff of the laboratory; it is among them, by the reciprocal action and reaction on one another of the chiefs, the followers, and the press, that opinion receives its first shape.[1]

[1] Small as it may still seem to an American, the class that forms public opinion has been steadily widening in England. Last century it consisted only of the then ruling class, — the great families, — the Houses of Parliament, a certain number of lawyers, with a very few journalists and clergymen, and a sort of fringe of educated men and monied men brought into relations with the rulers. This was the England which allowed George III. to alienate and lose the North American Colonies. Even then, no doubt, the mass of voters outside (extremely small when compared with the numbers of to-day) counted for something, for there was always a possibility of their interfering when some feeling spread among them, one or other of the parties being ready to stimulate and use such a feeling, and a general election enabling it to find expression in the counties and in a few of the boroughs. When the Reform

The second set of persons consists of those who watch public affairs with a certain measure of interest. When an important question arises, they look at the debates in Parliament or some platform deliverance by a leader, and they have at all times a notion of what is passing in the political world. They now and then attend a public meeting. They are not universally, but now pretty largely, enrolled as members of some political association. When an election arrives they go to vote of their own accord. They talk over politics after dinner or coming into town by a suburban train. The proportion of such persons is larger in the professional classes (and especially among the lawyers) than in the mercantile, larger in the upper mercantile than among the working men of the towns, larger among skilled than unskilled artisans, larger in the North than in the South, larger among the town workmen than among the newly enfranchised agricultural labourers. It varies in different parts of the country, and is perhaps relatively smaller in London than in other cities. If still less than a third of the total number of voters, it is nevertheless an increasing proportion.[1]

The third set includes all the rest of the voters. Though they possess political power, and are better pleased to have it, they do not really care about it — that is to say, politics occupy no appreciable space in their thoughts and interests. Some of them vote at elections because they consider themselves to belong to a party, or fancy that on a given occasion they have more to expect from the one party than from the other; or because they are brought up on election day by some one who can influence them. The number who vote tends to increase with the importation of party into municipal and other local contests; and from the same cause some now enrol themselves in party associations. Others will not take the trouble to go to the polls. No one, except on the stump, can

Bill of 1832 enlarged the suffrage, and almost extinguished the pocket boroughs what had been the ruling class sank into being merely the office-holding class; and now, though it dies hard, its monopoly of office is departing as its monopoly of sitting in Parliament did in 1832.

[1] In Chapter LVII., *ante*, I have attempted to distinguish an Inner and Outer Circle of persons who take an active part in political work. What I here call the first or opinion-making set would lie almost wholly within the Inner Circle, and would be much smaller than that circle.

attribute independent political thinking to this mass of persons, because their knowledge and interest, though growing under the influence of the privileges they enjoy, are still slight. Many have not even political prepossessions, and will stare or smile when asked to which party they belong. They count for little except at elections, and then chiefly as instruments to be used by others. So far as the formation or exercise of opinion goes, they may be left out of sight.[1]

It is obviously impossible to draw a sharp line between the second set and the third, or to estimate their relative numbers, because when politics are dull many persons subside into indifference whom the advent of a crisis may again arouse. And of course there are plenty of people in the second set who, though interested in politics, have no real knowledge or judgment about them. Such considerations, however, do not touch the point of the present analysis, which is to distinguish between the citizens who originate opinion (the first set), those who hold and somewhat modify it (the second set), and those who are rather to be deemed, and even that only if they can be brought to the poll, mere ballot-markers. The first set do the thinking; they scatter forth the ideas and arguments. The second set receive and test what is set before them. What their feeling or judgment approves they accept and give effect to by their votes; what they dislike or suspect is refused and falls dead, or possibly sets them the other way. The measure of the worth of a view or proposal — I do not mean its intrinsic worth but its power of pleasing the nation — is, however, not merely the breadth of the support it obtains, but also the zeal which it inspires in those who adopt it. Although persons in the second set usually belong to one or other

[1] What is said here cannot of course be proved, but will commend itself to any one who, knowing a large constituency, compares the number of persons who attend public meetings at an election and can be trusted to come of themselves to the polls with the total number of voters on the lists. In the London constituencies I doubt if more than 10 per cent of the nominal voting strength show their interest in either of these ways. From 25 to 40 per cent do not even vote. The voting proportion is larger in the north and west midland towns and in Scotland. In the old days of small constituencies, when it might have been supposed that the restriction of the franchise would have made it more prized, inexperienced candidates were always struck by the small percentage, out of those whom they personally canvassed, who seemed to care about politics, or even deemed themselves steady party men.

party,[1] and are therefore *prima facie* disposed to accept whatever comes from their party leaders, yet the degree of cordiality with which they accept indicates to a leader how their minds are moving, and becomes an element in his future calculations. Thus the second set, although receptive rather than creative, has an important function in moulding opinion, and giving it the shape and colour it finally takes when it has crystallized under the influence of a party struggle. The third set can scarcely be called a factor in the formation of opinion, except in so far as one particular proposal or cry may prove more attractive to it than another. It has some few fixed ideas or prejudices which a statesman must bear in mind, but in the main it is passive, consisting of persons who either follow the lead of members of the first or second sets, or who are too indifferent to move at all.

The United States present different phenomena. There what I have called the first set is extremely small. The third set is relatively smaller than in England, and but for the recent immigrants and the negroes would be insignificant. It is in the second set that opinion is formed as well as tested, created as well as moulded. Political light and heat do not radiate out from a centre as in England. They are diffused all through the atmosphere, and are little more intense in the inner sphere of practical politicians than elsewhere. The ordinary citizens are interested in politics, and watch them with intelligence, the same kind of intelligence (though a smaller quantity of it) as they apply to their own business. They are forced by incessant elections to take a more active part in public affairs than is taken by any European people. They think their own competence equal to that of their representatives and office-bearers; and they are not far wrong. They do not therefore look up to their statesmen for guidance, but look around to one another, carrying to its extreme the principle that in the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom.

In America, therefore, opinion is not made but grows. Of course it must begin somewhere; but it is often hard to say

[1] The increasingly party character of municipal contest tends to draw an always larger number of persons from the third class into the second, because being dragged up to vote at a municipal election they acquire, if not opinions, at least the habit of party action and of repeating party cries.

where or how. As there are in the country a vast number of minds similar in their knowledge, beliefs, and attitude, with few exceptionally powerful minds applying themselves to politics, it is natural that the same idea should often occur to several or many persons at the same time, that each event as it occurs should produce the same impression and evoke the same comments over a wide area. When everybody desires to agree with the majority, and values such accord more highly than the credit of originality, this tendency is all the stronger. An idea once launched, or a view on some current question propounded, flies everywhere on the wings of a press eager for novelties. Publicity is the easiest thing in the world to obtain; but as it is attainable by all notions, phrases, and projects, wise and foolish alike, the struggle for existence — that is to say, for public attention — is severe.

I do not, of course, deny that here, as everywhere else in the world, some one person or group must make a beginning, but seek to point out that, whereas in Europe it is patent who does make the beginning, in America a view often seems to arise spontaneously, and to be the work of many rather than of few. The individual counts for less, the mass counts for more. In propagating a doctrine not hitherto advocated by any party, the methods used are similar to those of England. A central society is formed, branch societies spring up over the country, a journal (perhaps several journals) is started, and if the movement thrives, an annual convention of its supporters is held, at which speeches are made and resolutions adopted. If any striking personality is connected with the movement as a leader, as Garrison was with Abolitionism, he cannot but become a sort of figure-head. Yet it happens more rarely in America than in England that an individual leader gives its character to a movement, partly because new movements less often begin among, or are taken up by, persons already known as practical politicians.

As regards opinion on the main questions of the hour, such as the extension of slavery long was, and civil service reform, the currency, the tariff, are now, it rises and falls, much as in any other country, under the influence of events which seem to make for one or the other of the contending views. There is this difference between America and Europe, that in the for-

mer speeches seem to influence the average citizen less, because he is more apt to do his own thinking; newspaper invective less, because he is used to it; current events rather more, because he is better informed of them. Party spirit is probably no stronger in America than in England, so far as a man's thinking and talking go, but it tells more upon him when he comes to vote.

An illustration of what has been said may be found in the fact that the proportion of persons who actually vote at an election to those whose names appear on the voting list is larger in America than in Europe. In some English constituencies this percentage does not exceed 60 per cent, though at exciting moments it is larger than this, taking the country as a whole. At the general election of 1892 it reached 77 per cent. In America 80 per cent may be a fair average in presidential elections, which call out the heaviest vote, and in 1880 and 1892 this proportion was exceeded. Something may be ascribed to the more elaborate local organization of American parties; but against this ought to be set the fact that the English voting mass includes not quite two-thirds, the American nearly the whole, of the adult male population, and that the English voters are the more solid and well-to-do part of the population.

Is there, then, in the United States, no inner sphere of thinkers, writers, and speakers, corresponding to what we have called the "first set" in England?

There are individual men corresponding to individuals in that English set, and probably quite as numerous. There are journalists of great ability, there are a few literary men, clergymen and teachers, a good many lawyers, some business men, some few politicians. But they are isolated and unorganized, and do not constitute a class. Most of them are primarily occupied with their own avocations, and have only spare time to give to political thinking or writing. They are mostly resident in or near the Eastern and one or two of the largest Western cities, and through many large tracts of country scarce any are to be found. In England the profession of opinion-making and leading is the work of specialists; in America, except as regards the few journalists and statesmen foresaid, of amateurs. As the books of amateurs have merits

which those of professional authors are apt to want, so something is gained by the absence of the professional element from American political opinion. But that which these amateurs produce is less coherent, less abundant, and less promptly effective upon the mass of the citizens than the corresponding English product. In fact, the individual Americans whom we are considering can (except the journalists and statesmen aforesaid) be distinguished from the mass of citizens only by their superior intellectual competence and their keener interest in public affairs. (Of the "professional politicians" there is no question, because it is in the getting and keeping of places that these gentlemen are occupied.) We may therefore repeat the proposition, that in America opinion does not originate in a particular class, but grows up in the nation at large, though, of course, there are leading minds in the nation who have more to do with its formation than the run of their fellow-citizens. A good instance of the power such men may exercise is afforded by the success of the civil service reform movement, which began among a few enlightened citizens in the Eastern States, who by degrees leavened, or were thought to be leavening, the minds of their fellows to such an extent that Congress was forced, sorely against the grain, to bring in and pass the appropriate legislation. Another instance may be found in the swift success obtained by those who advocated the secret or "Australian" ballot, a measure not specially desired by the "politicians."

But the most striking illustration is the recent victory of the agitation for international copyright. A few literary men, seconded after a while by a very few publishers, had for weary years maintained what seemed a hopeless struggle for the extension to foreign authors of the right to acquire copyright in America, theretofore reserved to citizens only. These men were at first ridiculed. People asked how they could expect that the nation, whose chief reading was in European books sold very cheap because the author received no profit, would raise the price of these books against itself? Neither Republicans nor Democrats had anything to gain by passing the bill, and Congress, by large majorities, rejected or refused to advance (which came to the same thing) every bill presented to it. The agitators, however, persevered, receiving help from

sympathetic press, and so worked upon the honour and good ense of the people that Congress at last came round. The ostile interests fought hard, and extorted some concessions. But in 1891 the bill was passed.[1]

We may now ask in what manner opinion, formed or form-ng, is able to influence the conduct of affairs?

The legal machinery through which the people are by the Constitution (Federal and State) invited to govern is that of lections. Occasionally, when the question of altering a State Constitution comes up, the citizen votes directly for or against proposition put to him in the form of a constitutional amend-ient; but otherwise it is only by voting for a man as candidate hat he can give expression to his views, and directly support r oppose some policy. Now, in every country voting for a ian is an inadequate way of expressing one's views of policy, ecause the candidate is sure to differ in one or more questions rom many of those who belong to the party. It is especially nadequate in the United States, because the strictness of party iscipline leaves little freedom of individual thought or action o the member of a legislature, because the ordinary politician as little interest in anything but the regular party pro-ramme, and because in no party are the citizens at large per-nitted to select their candidate, seeing that he is found for nem and forced on them by the professionals of the party rganization. While, therefore, nothing is easier than for pinion which runs in the direct channel of party to give ffect to itself frequently and vigorously, nothing is harder ian for opinion which wanders out of that channel to find a egal and regular means of bringing itself to bear upon those ho govern either as legislators or executive officers. This is ie weak point of the American party system, perhaps of very party system, from the point of view of the independent-inded citizen, as it is the strong point from that of the party anager. A body of unorganized opinion is, therefore, help-ss in the face of compact parties. It is obliged to organize. When organized for the promotion of a particular view or roposition, it has in the United States three courses open o it.

[1] "Never despair of America!" was the exclamation of an eminent literary an who had been one of the most active promoters of the measure.

The first is to capture one or other of the great standing parties, *i.e.* to persuade or frighten that party into adopting this view as part of its programme, or, to use the technical term, making it a plank of the platform, in which case the party candidates will be bound to support it. This is the most effective course, but the most difficult; for a party is sure to have something to lose as well as to gain by embracing a new dogma. Why should such parties as those of America have lately been, trouble themselves with taking up new questions, unless they are satisfied they will gain thereby? Their old dogmas are indeed worn threadbare, but have been hitherto found sufficient to cover them.

The second course is for the men who hold the particular view to declare themselves a new party, put forward their own programme, run their own candidates. Besides being costly and troublesome, this course would be thought ridiculous where the view or proposition is not one of first-rate importance, which has already obtained wide support. Where, however, it is applicable, it is worth taking, even when the candidates cannot be carried, for it serves as an advertisement, and it alarms the old party, from which it withdraws voting strength in the persons of the dissidents.

The third is to cast the voting weight of the organized promoters of the doctrine or view in question into the scale of whichever party shows the greatest friendliness, or seems most open to conversion. As in many States the regular parties are pretty equally balanced, even a comparatively weak body of opinion may decide the result. Such a body does not necessarily forward its own view, for the candidates whom its vote carries are nowise pledged to its programme.[1] But it has made itself felt, shown itself a power to be reckoned with, improved its chances of capturing one or other of the regular parties, or of running candidates of its own on some future occasion. When this transfer of the solid vote of a body of

[1] The practice of interrogating candidates with a view to obtain pledges from them to vote in a particular sense is less used in America than in England. The rigour of party discipline, and the fact that business is divided between the Federal and the State legislatures may have something to do with this difference. However, American candidates are sometimes pressed by questions and demands from groups advocating moral reforms, such as liquor prohibition.

agitators is the result of a bargain with the old party which gets the vote, it is called "selling out"; and in such cases it sometimes happens that the bargain secures one or two offices for the incoming allies in consideration of the strength they have brought. But if the new group be honestly thinking of its doctrines and not of the offices, the terms it will ask will be the nomination of good candidates, or a more friendly attitude towards the new view.

These are the ways in which either the minority of a party, holding some doctrine outside the regular party programme, or a new group aspiring to be a party, may assert itself at elections. The third is applicable wherever the discipline of the section which has arisen within a party is so good that its members can be trusted to break away from their former affiliation, and vote solid for the side their leaders have agreed to favour. It is a potent weapon, and liable to be abused. But in a country where the tide runs against minorities and small groups, it is most necessary. The possibility of its employment acts as a check on the regular parties, disposing them to abstain from legislation which might irritate any body of growing opinion and tend to crystallize it as a new organization, and making them more tolerant of minor divergences from the dogmas of the orthodox programme than their fierce love of party uniformity would otherwise permit.

So far we have been considering the case of persons advocating some specific opinion or scheme. As respects the ordinary conduct of business by officials and legislators, the fear of popular displeasure to manifest itself at the next election is, of course, the most powerful of restraining influences. Under a system of balanced authorities, such fear helps to prevent or remove deadlocks as well as the abuse of power by any one authority. A President (or State governor) who has vetoed bills passed by Congress (or his State legislature) is emboldened to go on doing so when he finds public opinion on his side; and Congress (or the State legislature) will hesitate, though the requisite majority may be forthcoming, to pass these bills over the veto. A majority in the House of Representatives, or in a State legislative body, which has abused the power of closing debate by the "previous question" rule, may be frightened by expressions of popular disapproval from

repeating the offence. When the two branches of a legislature differ, and a valuable bill has failed, or when there has been vexatious filibustering, public opinion fixes the blame on the party primarily responsible for the loss of good measures or public time, and may punish it at the next election. Thus, in many ways and on many occasions, though not so often or so fully as is needed, the vision of the polls, seen some months or even years off, has power to terrify and warn selfish politicians. As the worth of courts of law is to be estimated not merely by the offences they punish and the suits they try, but even more by the offences from which the fear of penalties deters bad men, and by the payments which the prospect of a writ extracts from reluctant debtors, so a healthy and watchful public opinion makes itself felt in preventing foolish or corrupt legislation and executive jobbery. Mischief is checked in America more frequently than anywhere else by the fear of exposure, or by newspaper criticisms on the first stage of a bad scheme. And, of course, the frequency of elections — in most respects a disadvantage to the country — has the merit of bringing the prospect of punishment nearer.

It will be asked how the fear is brought home, seeing that the result of a coming election must usually be uncertain. Sometimes it is not brought home. The erring majority in a legislature may believe they have the people with them, or the governor may think his jobs will be forgotten. Generally, however, there are indications of the probable set of opinion in the language held by moderate men and the less partisan newspapers. When some of the organs of the party which is in fault begin to blame it, danger is in the air, for the other party is sure to use the opening thus given to it. And hence, of course, the control of criticism is most effective where parties are nearly balanced. Opinion seems to tell with special force when the question is between a legislative body passing bills or ordinances, and a president or governor, or mayor, vetoing them, the legislature recoiling whenever they think the magistrate has got the people behind him. Even small fluctuations in a vote produce a great impression on the minds of politicians.

The constancy or mutability of electoral bodies is a difficult phenomenon to explain, especially where secret voting prevails,

and a dangerous one to generalize on. The tendency of the electoral vote in any constituency to shift from Tory to Whig or Whig to Tory, used in England to be deemed to indicate the presence of a corrupt element. It was a black mark against a borough. In America it sometimes deserves the same interpretation, for there are corruptible masses in not a few districts. But there are also cases in which it points to the existence of an exceptionally thoughtful and unprejudiced element in the population, an element which rejects party dictation, and seeks to cast its vote for the best man. The average American voter is more likely to be a partisan than the English, and is, I think, less capricious, and therefore if a transfer of votes from one party to the other does not arise from some corrupt influence, it betokens serious disapproval on the part of the Bolters. Fluctuations are most frequent in one or two of the least sober and steady Western States, and in some of the most enlightened, such as New York and Massachusetts. In the former the people may be carried away by a sudden impulse; in the latter there is a section which judges candidates more by personal merits than by party professions.

These defects which may be noted in the constitutional mechanism for enabling public opinion to rule promptly and smoothly, are, in a measure, covered by the expertness of Americans in using all kinds of voluntary and private agencies for the diffusion and expression of opinion. Where the object is to promote some particular cause, associations are formed and federated to one another, funds are collected, the press is set to work, lectures are delivered. When the law can profitably be invoked (which is often the case in a country governed by constitutions standing above the legislature), counsel are retained and suits instituted, all with the celerity and skill which long practice in such work has given. If the cause has a moral bearing, efforts are made to enlist the religious or semi-religious magazines, and the ministers of religion.[1] Deputations proceed to Washington or to the State capital, and lay siege to individual legislators. Sometimes a distinct set of women's societies is created, whose action on and through women is all the more powerful because the deference shown

[1] In Philadelphia, during a struggle against the City Boss, the clergy were requested to preach election sermons.

to the so-called weaker sex enables them to do what would be resented in men. Not long ago, I think in Iowa, when a temperance ticket was being run at the elections, parties of ladies gathered in front of the polling booths and sang hymns all day while the citizens voted. Every one remembers the "Women's Whisky War" when, in several Western States, bands of women entered the drinking saloons and, by entreaties and reproaches, drove out the customers. In no country has any sentiment which touches a number of persons so many ways of making itself felt; though, to be sure, when the first and chief effort of every group is to convince the world that it is strong, and growing daily stronger, great is the difficulty of determining whether those who are vocal are really numerous or only noisy.

For the promotion of party opinion on the leading questions that divide or occupy parties, there exist, of course, the regular party organizations, whose complex and widely ramified mechanism has been described in an earlier chapter. Opinion is, however, the thing with which this mechanism is at present least occupied. Its main objects are the selection of the party candidates and the conduct of the canvass at elections. Traces of the other purpose remain in the practice of adopting, at State and national conventions, a platform, or declaration of principles and views, which is the electoral manifesto of the party, embodying the tenets which it is supposed to live for. A convention is a body fitted neither by its numbers nor its composition for the discussion and sifting of political doctrines; but, even if it were so fitted, that is not the work to which its masters would set it. A "platform" is invariably prepared by a small committee, and usually adopted by the general committee, and by the convention, with little change. Its tendency is neither to define nor to convince, but rather to attract and to confuse. It is a mixture of denunciation, declamation, and conciliation. It reprobates the opposite party for their past misdeeds, and "views with alarm" their present policy. It repeats the tale of the services which the party of those who issue it has rendered in the past, is replete with sounding democratic generalities, and attempts so to expand and expound the traditional party tenets as to make these include all sound doctrines, and deserve the support of all good

citizens. At present neither platforms nor the process that produces them have a powerful influence on the maturing and clarification of political opinion. However, in times more stirring than the present, as in the days immediately preceding the Civil War, conventions have recorded the acceptance of certain vital propositions, and rejection of certain dangerous proposals, by one or other of the great parties, and they may again have to do so, not to add that an imprudent platform lays a party open to damaging attacks. When any important election comes off, the party organization sends its speakers out on stumping tours, and distributes a flood of campaign literature. At other times opinion moves in a different plane from that of party machinery, and is scarcely affected by it.

One might expect that in the United States the thoughts of the people would be more equably and uniformly employed on politics than in European countries. The contrary is the case. Opinion, no doubt, is always alive and vigilant, always in process of formation, growth, and decay. But its activity is less continuous and sustained than in Europe, because there is a greater difference between the spring-tide of a presidential campaign year and the neap-tides of the three off years than there is between one year and another under the European system of chambers which may be dissolved and ministries which may be upset at any moment. Excitement at one time is succeeded by exhaustion at another. America suffers from a sort of intermittent fever — what one may call a quintan ague. Every fourth year there come terrible shakings, passing into the hot fit of the presidential election; then follows what physicians call "the interval"; then again the fit. In Europe the persons who move in the inner sphere of politics, give unbroken attention to political problems, always discussing them both among themselves and before the people. As the corresponding persons in America are not organized into a class, and to some extent not engaged in practical politics, the work of discussion has been left to be done, in the three "off years," by the journalists and a few of the more active and thoughtful statesmen, with casual aid from such private citizens as may be interested. Now many problems require uninterrupted and what may be called scientific or professional study. Foreign policy obviously presents such problems. The shortcomings

of modern England in the conduct of foreign affairs have been not unreasonably attributed to the fact that, while the attention of her statesmen is constantly distracted from them by domestic struggles, her people have not been accustomed to turn their eyes abroad except when some exciting event, such as the war of 1870 or the Bulgarian massacre of 1876, forces them to do so. Hence a State like Germany, where a strong throne keeps a strong minister in power for long periods, obtains advantages which must be credited not wholly to the wisdom of the statesmen, but also to the difficulties under which their rivals in more democratic countries labour. America has little occasion to think of foreign affairs, but some of her domestic difficulties are such as to demand that careful observation and unbroken reflection which neither her executive magistrates, nor her legislatures, nor any leading class among her people now give.

Those who know the United States and have been struck by the quantity of what is called politics there, may think that this description underrates the volume and energy of public political discussion. I admit the endless hubbub, the constant elections in one district or another, the paragraphs in the newspapers as to the movements or intentions of this or that prominent man, the reports of what is doing in Congress and in the State legislatures, the decisions of the Federal Courts in constitutional questions, the rumours about new combinations, the revelations of Ring intrigues, the criticisms on appointments. It is nevertheless true that in proportion to the number of words spoken, articles printed, telegrams sent, and acts performed, less than is needed is done to form serious political thought, and bring practical problems towards a solution. I once travelled through Transylvania with Mr. Leslie Stephen in a peasant's waggon, a rude, long, low structure filled with hay. The roads were rough and stony, the horses jangled their bells, the driver shouted to the horses and cracked his whip, the wheels clanked, the boards rattled, we were deafened and shaken and jolted. We fancied ourselves moving rapidly so long as we looked straight in front, but a glance at the trees on the roadside showed that the speed was about three miles an hour. So the pother and din of American politics keep the people awake, and give them a sense of stir and motion, but the

machine of government carries them slowly onward. Fortunately they have no need to hurry. It is not so much by or through the machinery of government as by their own practical good sense, which at last finds a solution the politicians may have failed to find, that the American people advance. When a European visitor dines with a company of the best citizens in an Eastern city, such as Boston or Baltimore, he is struck by the acuteness, the insight, the fairness with which the condition and requirements of the country are discussed, the freedom from such passion or class feeling as usually clouds equally able Europeans, the substantial agreement between members of both the great parties as to the reforms that are wanted, the patriotism which is so proud of the real greatness of the Union as frankly to acknowledge its defects, the generous appreciation of all that is best in the character or political methods of other nations. One feels what a reserve fund of wisdom and strength the country has in such men, who so far from being aristocrats or recluses, are usually the persons whom their native fellow-townsmen best know and most respect as prominent in business and in the professions. In ordinary times the practical concern of such men with either national or local politics is no greater, possibly less, than that of the leaders of business in an English town towards its municipal affairs. But when there comes an uprising against the bosses, it is these men who are called upon to put themselves at the head of it; or when a question like that of civil service reform has been before the nation for some time, it is their opinion which strikes the keynote for that of their city or district, and which shames or alarms the professional politicians. Men of the same type, though individually less conspicuous than those whom I take as examples, are to be found in many of the smaller towns, especially in the Eastern and Middle States, and as time goes on their influence grows. Much of the value of this most educated and reflective class in America consists in their being no longer blindly attached to their party, because more alive to the principles for which parties ought to exist. They may be numerically a small minority of the voters, but as in many States the two regular parties command a nearly equal normal voting strength, a small section detached from either party can turn an election by throwing its vote for the

candidate, to whichever party he belongs, whom it thinks capable and honest. Thus an independent group wields a power altogether disproportionate to its numbers, and by a sort of side wind can not only make its hostility feared, but secure a wider currency for its opinions. What opinion chiefly needs in America in order to control the politicians is not so much men of leisure, for men of leisure may be dilettantes and may lack a grip of realities, but a more sustained activity on the part of the men of vigorously independent minds, a more sedulous effort on their part to impress their views upon the masses, and a disposition on the part of the ordinary well-meaning but often inattentive citizens to prefer the realities of good administration to outworn party cries.

CHAPTER LXXXIV

THE TYRANNY OF THE MAJORITY

The expression "tyranny of the majority" is commonly used to denote any abuse by the majority of the powers which it enjoys, in free countries under and through the law, and in all countries outside the law. Such abuse will not be tyrannous in the sense of being illegal, as men called a usurper like Dionysius of Syracuse or Louis Napoleon in France a tyrant, for in free countries whatever the majority chooses to do in the prescribed constitutional way will be legal. It will be tyrannous in the sense of the lines

> "O it is excellent
> To have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous
> To use it like a giant."

That is to say, tyranny consists in the wanton or inequitable use of strength by the stronger, in the use of it to do things which one equal would not attempt against another. A majority is tyrannical when it decides without hearing the minority, when it suppresses fair and temperate criticism on its own acts, when it insists on restraining men in matters where restraint is not required by the common interest, when it forces men to contribute money to objects which they disapprove, and which the common interest does not demand, when it subjects to social penalties persons who disagree from it in matters not vital to the common welfare. The element of tyranny lies in the wantonness of the act, a wantonness springing from the insolence which sense of overwhelming power breeds, or in the fact that it is a misuse for one purpose of authority granted for another. It consists not in the form of the act, which may be perfectly legal, but in the spirit and temper it reveals, and in the sense of injustice and oppression which it evokes in the minority.

Philosophers have long since perceived that the same tendencies to a wanton or unjust abuse of power which exist in a despot or a ruling oligarchy may be expected in a democracy from the ruling majority, because they are tendencies incidental to human nature.[1] The danger was felt and feared by the sages of 1787, and a passage in the *Federalist* (No. L.) dwells on the safeguards which the great size of a Federal republic, and the diverse elements of which it will be composed, offer against the tendency of a majority to oppress a minority.

Since Tocqueville dilated upon this as the capital fault of the American government and people, Europeans, already prepared to expect to find the tyranny of the majority a characteristic sin of democratic nations, have been accustomed to think of the United States as disgraced by it, and on the strength of this instance have predicted it as a necessary result of the growth of democracy in the Old World. It is therefore worth while to inquire what foundation exists for the reproach as addressed to the Americans of to-day.

We may look for signs of this tyranny in three quarters — firstly, in the legislation of Congress; secondly, in the constitutions and statutes of the States; thirdly, in the action of public opinion and sentiment outside the sphere of law.

The Federal Constitution, which has not only limited the competence of Congress, but hedged it round with many positive prohibitions, has closed some of the avenues by which a majority might proceed to abuse its powers. Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, opportunities for debate, are all amply secured. The power of taxation, and that of regulating commerce, might conceivably be used to oppress certain classes of persons, as, for instance, if a prohibitory duty were to be laid on certain articles which a minority desired and the majority condemned the use of. But nothing of the sort has been attempted. Whatever may be thought of the expediency of the present tariff, which, no doubt, favours one class, it cannot be said to oppress any class. In its political action, as, for instance, during the struggle over slavery, when for a while it refused

[1] The comparison of the majority to an absolute monarch is as old as Aristotle. μόναρχος ὁ δῆμος γίνεται (*Polit.* iv. 4, 26); ὥσπερ τυράννῳ τῷ δήμῳ χαριζόμενοι (*Ibid.* ii. 12, 4). In the Greek cities, where the respect for law was weak, a triumphant party frequently overrode the law, just as the tyrants did.

to receive Abolitionist petitions, and even tried to prevent the transmission by mail of Abolitionist matter, and again during and after the war in some of its reconstruction measures, the majority, under the pressure of excitement, exercised its powers harshly and unwisely. But such political action is hardly the kind of action to which the charge we are examining applies.

In the States, a majority of the citizens may act either directly in enacting (or amending) a constitution, or through their legislature by passing statutes. We might expect to find instances of abuse of power more in the former than in the latter class of cases, because, though the legislature is habitually and the people of the State only intermittently active, the legislatures have now been surrounded by a host of constitutional limitations which a tyrannical majority would need some skill to evade. However, one discovers wonderfully little in the State Constitutions now in force of which a minority can complain. These instruments contain a great deal of ordinary law and administrative law. If the tendency to abuse legislative power to the injury of any class were general, instances of it could not fail to appear. One does not find them. There are some provisions strictly regulating corporations, and especially railroads and banks, which may perhaps be unwise, and which in limiting the modes of using capital apply rather to the rich than to the masses. But such provisions cannot be called wanton or oppressive.

The same remark applies to the ordinary statutes of the States, so far as I have been able to ascertain their character. They can rarely be used to repress opinion or its expression, because the State Constitutions contain ample guarantees for free speech, a free press, and the right of public meeting. For the same reason, they cannot encroach on the personal liberty of the citizen, nor on the full enjoyment of private property. In all such fundamentals the majority has prudently taken the possible abuse of its power out of the hands of the legislature.

When we come to minor matters, we are met by the difficulty of determining what is a legitimate exercise of legislative authority. Nowhere are men agreed as to the limits of state interference. Some few think that law ought not to restrict the sale of intoxicants at all; many more that it ought not to make the procuring of them, for purposes of pleasure, difficult

or impossible. Others hold that the common welfare justifies prohibition. Some deem it unjust to tax a man, and especially an unmarried man, for the support of public schools, or at any rate of public schools other than elementary. To most Roman Catholics it seems unjust to refuse denominational schools a share of the funds raised by taxing, among other citizens, those who hold it a duty to send their children to schools in which their own faith is inculcated. Some think a law tyrannical which forbids a man to exclude others from ground which he keeps waste and barren, while others blame the law which permits a man to reserve, as they think, tyrannically, large tracts of country for his own personal enjoyment. So any form of state establishment or endowment of a particular creed or religious body will by some be deemed an abuse, by others a wise and proper use of state authority. Remembering such differences of opinion, all I can say is that even those who take the narrower view of state functions will find little to censure in the legislation of American States. They may blame the restriction or prohibition of the sale of intoxicants. They may think that the so-called "moral legislation" for securing the purity of literature, and for protecting the young against various temptations, attempts too much. They may question the expediency of the legislation intended for the benefit of working men. But there are few of these provisions which can be called harsh or tyrannical, which display a spirit that ignores or tramples on the feelings or rights of a minority. The least defensible statutes are perhaps those which California has aimed at the Chinese (who are not technically a minority since they are not citizens at all), and those by which some Southern States have endeavoured to accentuate the separation between whites and negroes, forbidding them to be taught in the same schools or colleges or to travel in the same cars.

We come now to the third way in which a majority may tyrannize, *i.e.* by the imposition of purely social penalties, from mere disapproval up to insult, injury, and boycotting. The greatest of Athenian statesmen claimed for his countrymen that they set an example to the rest of Greece in that enlightened toleration which does not even visit with black looks those who hold unpopular opinions, or venture in anywise to

differ from the prevailing sentiment. Such enlightenment is doubtless one of the latest fruits and crowns of a high civilization, and all the more to be admired when it is not the result of indifference, but coexists with energetic action in the field of politics or religion or social reform.

If social persecution exists in the America of to-day, it is only in a few dark corners. One may travel all over the North and West, mingling with all classes and reading the newspapers, without hearing of it. As respects religion, so long as one does not openly affront the feelings of one's neighbours, one may say what one likes, and go or not go to church. Doubtless a man, and still more a woman, will be better thought of, especially in a country place or small town, for being a church-member and Sunday-school teacher. But no one suffers in mind, body, or estate for simply holding aloof from a religious or any other voluntary association. He would be more likely to suffer in an English village. Even in the South, where a stricter standard of orthodoxy is maintained among the Protestant clergy than in the North or West, a layman may think as he pleases. It is the same as regards social questions, and of course as regards politics. To boycott a man for his politics, or even to discourage his shop in the way not uncommon in parts of rural England and Ireland, would excite indignation in America; as the attempts of some labour organizations to boycott firms resisting strikes have aroused strong displeasure. If in the South a man took to cultivating the friendship of negroes and organizing them in clubs, or if in the far West a man made himself the champion of the Indians, he might find his life become unpleasant, though one hears little of recent instances of the kind. In any part of the country he who should use his rights of property in a hard or unneighbourly way, who, for instance, should refuse all access to a waterfall or a beautiful point of view, would be reprobated and sent to Coventry. I know of no such cases; perhaps the fear of general disapproval prevents their arising.

In saying that there is no social persecution, I do not deny that in some places, as, for instance, in the smaller towns of the West, there is too little allowance for difference of tastes and pursuits, too much disposition to expect every family to conform to the same standard of propriety, and follow the same

habits of life. A person acting, however innocently, without regard to the beliefs and prejudices of his neighbours would be talked about, and perhaps looked askance upon. Many a man used to the variety of London or Washington would feel the monotony of Western life, and the uniform application of its standards, irksome and even galling. But, so far as I could ascertain, he would have nothing specific to complain of. And these Western towns become every day more like the cities of the East. Taking the country all in all, it is hard to imagine more complete liberty than individuals and groups enjoy either to express and propagate their views, or to act as they please within the limits of the law, limits which, except as regards the sale of intoxicants, are drawn as widely as in Western Europe.

Fifty or sixty years ago it was very different. Congress was then as now debarred from oppressive legislation. But in some Northern States the legislatures were not slow to deal harshly with persons or societies who ran counter to the dominant sentiment. The persecution by the legislature of Connecticut, as well as by her own townsfolk, of Miss Prudence Crandall, a benevolent Quakeress who had opened a school for negro children, is a well-remembered instance. A good many rigidly Puritanic statutes stood unrepealed in New England though not always put in force against the transgressor. In the Slave States laws of the utmost severity punished whosoever should by word or act assail the "peculiar institution." Even more tyrannical than the laws was the sentiment of the masses. In Boston a mob, a well-dressed mob, largely composed of the richer sort of people, hunted Garrison for his life through the streets because he was printing an Abolitionist journal; a mob in Illinois shot Elijah Lovejoy for the same offence; and as late as 1844 another Illinois crowd killed Joseph Smith, the Mormon prophet, who, whatever may be thought of his honesty or his doctrines, was as much entitled to the protection of the laws as any other citizen. In the South, as every one knows, there was a reign of terror as regards slavery. Any one suspected of Abolitionism might think himself lucky if he escaped with tar and feathers, and was not shot or hanged almost to death. This extreme sensitiveness was of course confined to a few burning questions

out the habit of repressing by law or without law obnoxious opinions was likely to spread, and did spread, at least in the South, to other matters also. As regards thought and opinion generally over the Union, Tocqueville declares : —

"Je ne connais pas de pays où il règne, en général, moins d'indépendance d'esprit et de véritable liberté de discussion qu'en Amérique. La majorité trace un cercle formidable autour de la pensée. Au dedans de ces limites, l'écrivain est libre, mais malheur a lui s'il ose en sortir ! Ce n'est pas qu'il ait à craindre un auto-da-fé, mais il est en butte à des dégoûts de tout genre et à des persécutions de tous les jours. La carrière politique lui est fermée : il a offensé la seule puissance qui ait la faculté de l'ouvrir. On lui refuse tout, jusqu'à la gloire." — Vol. ii. ch. 7.

He ascribes not only the want of great statesmen, but the low level of literature, learning, and thought, to this total absence of intellectual freedom.

It is hard for any one who knows the Northern States now to believe that this can have been a just description of them so lately as sixty years ago. One is tempted to think that Tocqueville's somewhat pessimistic friends in New England, mortified by the poverty of intellectual production around them, may have exaggerated the repressive tendencies in which they found the cause of that poverty. We can now see that the explanation was erroneous. Freedom does not necessarily bring fertility. As they erred in their diagnosis, they may have erred in their observation of the symptoms.

Assuming, however, that the description was a just one, how are we to explain the change to the absolute freedom and tolerance of to-day, when every man may sit under his own vine and fig-tree and say and do (provided he drink not the juice of that vine) what he pleases, none making him afraid ?

One may suspect that Tocqueville, struck by the enormous power of general opinion, attributed too much of the submissiveness which he observed to the active coercion of the majority, and too little to that tendency of the minority to acquiescence, which will be discussed in the next succeeding chapter. Setting this aside, however, and assuming that the majority did in those days really tyrannize, several causes may be assigned for its having ceased to do so. One is the absence

of violent passions. Slavery, the chief source of ferocity, was to the heated minds of the South a matter of life or death; Abolitionism seemed to many in the North a disloyal heresy, the necessary parent of disunion. Since the Civil War there has been no crisis calculated to tempt majorities to abuse their legal powers. Partisanship has for years past been more intense in Great Britain — not to say Ireland — and France than in America. When Tocqueville saw the United States, the democratic spirit was in the heyday of its youthful strength, flushed with self-confidence, intoxicated with the exuberance of its own freedom. The first generation of statesmen whose authority had restrained the masses, had just quitted the stage. The anarchic teachings of Jefferson had borne fruit. Administration and legislation, hitherto left to the educated classes, had been seized by the rude hands of men of low social position and scanty knowledge. A reign of brutality and violence had set in over large regions of the country. Neither literature nor the universities exercised as yet any sensible power. The masses were so persuaded of their immense superiority to all other peoples, past as well as present, that they would listen to nothing but flattery, and their intolerance spread from politics into every other sphere. Our European philosopher may therefore have been correct in his description of the facts as he saw them: he erred in supposing them essential to a democratic government. As the nation grew, it purged away these faults of youth and inexperience, and the stern discipline of the Civil War taught it sobriety, and in giving it something to be really proud of, cleared away the fumes of self-conceit.

The years which have passed since the war have been years of immensely extended and popularized culture and enlightenment. Bigotry in religion and in everything else has been broken down. The old landmarks have been removed: the habits and methods of free inquiry, if not generally practised, have at least become superficially familiar; the "latest results," as people call them, of European thought have been brought to the knowledge of the native Americans more fully than to the masses of Europe. At the same time, as all religious and social religious questions, except those which relate to education, are entirely disjoined from politics and the State, neither those who stand by the old views, nor those who embrace the new, carry the

bitterness into their controversies which is natural in countries where religious questions are also party questions, where the clergy are a privileged and salaried order, where the throne is held bound to defend the altar, and the workman is taught to believe that both are leagued against him. The influence of these causes will, it may be predicted, be permanent. Should passion again invade politics, or should the majority become convinced that its interests will be secured by overtaxing the few, one can imagine the tendency of fifty years ago reappearing in new forms. But in no imaginable future is there likely to be any attempt to repress either by law or by opinion the free exercise and expression of speculative thought on morals, on religion, and indeed on every matter not within the immediate range of politics.

If the above account be correct, the tyranny of the majority is no longer a blemish on the American system, and the charges brought against democracy from the supposed example of America are groundless. As tyranny is one of those evils which tends to perpetuate itself, those who had been oppressed revenging themselves by becoming oppressors in their turn, the fact that a danger once dreaded has now disappeared is no small evidence of the recuperative forces of the American government, and the healthy tone of the American people.

CHAPTER LXXXV

THE FATALISM OF THE MULTITUDE

One feature of thought and sentiment in the United States needs special examination because it has been by most observers either ignored or confounded with a phenomenon which is at bottom quite different. This is a fatalistic attitude of mind, which, since it disposes men to acquiesce in the rule of numbers, has been, when perceived, attributed to or identified with what is commonly called the Tyranny of the Majority. The tendency to fatalism is never far from mankind. It is one of the first solutions of the riddle of the earth propounded by metaphysics. It is one of the last propounded by science. It has at all times formed the background to religions. No race is naturally less disposed to a fatalistic view of things than is the Anglo-American, with its restless self-reliant energy.

Nil actum reputans dum quid restaret agendum,

its slender taste for introspection or meditation. Nevertheless, even in this people the conditions of life and politics have bred a sentiment or tendency which seems best described by the name of fatalism.

In small and rude communities, every free man, or at least every head of a household, feels his own significance and realizes his own independence. He relies on himself, he is little interfered with by neighbours or rulers.[1] His will and his action count for something in the conduct of the affairs of the community he belongs to, yet common affairs are few compared to those in which he must depend on his own exertions.

[1] The kind of self-reliant attitude I am seeking to describe is quite a different thing from the supposed "state of nature" in which a man has no legal relations with his fellows. It may exist (as in early Rome) among the members of a community closely united by legal ties.

The most striking pictures of individualism that literature has preserved for us are those of the Homeric heroes, and of the even more terrible and self-reliant warriors of the Scandinavian sagas, men like Ragnar Lodbrog and Egil, son of Skallagrim, who did not regard even the gods, but trusted to their own might and main. In more developed states of society organized on an oligarchic basis, such as were the feudal kingdoms of the Middle Ages, or in socially aristocratic countries such as most parts of Europe have remained down to our own time, the bulk of the people are no doubt in a dependent condition, but each person derives a certain sense of personal consequence from the strength of his group and of the person or family at the head of it. Moreover, the upper class, being the class which thinks and writes, as well as leads in action, impresses its own type upon the character of the whole nation, and that type is still individualistic, with a strong consciousness of personal free will, and a tendency for each man, if not to think for himself, at least to value and to rely on his own opinion.

Let us suppose, however, that the aristocratic structure of society has been dissolved, that the old groups have disappeared, that men have come to feel themselves members rather of the nation than of classes, or families, or communities within the nation, that a levelling process has destroyed the ascendency of birth and rank, that large landed estates no longer exist, that many persons in what was previously the humbler class have acquired possession of property, that knowledge is easily accessible and the power of using it no longer confined to the few. Under such conditions of social equality the habit of intellectual command and individual self-confidence will have vanished from the leading class, which creates the type of national character, and will exist nowhere in the nation.

Let us suppose, further, that political equality has gone hand in hand with the levelling down of social eminence. Every citizen enjoys the same right of electing the representatives and officials, the same right of himself becoming a representative or an official. Every one is equally concerned in the conduct of public affairs, and since no man's opinion, however great his superiority in wealth, knowledge, or

personal capacity, is legally entitled to any more weight than another's, no man is entitled to set special value on his own opinion, or to expect others to defer to it; for pretensions to authority will be promptly resented. All disputes are referred to the determination of the majority, there being no legal distinction between the naturally strong and naturally weak, between the rich and the poor, between the wise and the foolish. In such a state of things the strong man's self-confidence and sense of individual force will inevitably have been lowered, because he will feel that he is only one of many, that his vote or voice counts for no more than that of his neighbour, that he can prevail, if at all, only by keeping himself on a level with his neighbour and recognizing the latter's personality as being every whit equal to his own.

Suppose, further, that all this takes place in an enormously large and populous country, where the governing voters are counted by so many millions that each individual feels himself a mere drop in the ocean, the influence which he can exert privately, whether by his personal gifts or by his wealth, being confined to the small circle of his town or neighbourhood. On all sides there stretches round him an illimitable horizon; and beneath the blue vault which meets that horizon there is everywhere the same busy multitude with its clamour of mingled voices which he hears close by. In this multitude his own being seems lost. He has the sense of insignificance which overwhelms us when at night we survey the host of heaven, and know that from even the nearest fixed star this planet of ours is invisible.

In such a country, where complete political equality is strengthened and perfected by complete social equality, where the will of the majority is absolute, unquestioned, always invoked to decide every question, and where the numbers which decide are so vast that one comes to regard them as one regards the largely working forces of nature, we may expect to find certain feelings and beliefs dominant in the minds of men.

One of these is that the majority must prevail. All free government rests on this belief, for there is no other way of working free government. To obey the majority is, therefore, both a necessity and a duty, a duty because the alternative would be ruin and the breaking-up of laws.

Out of this dogma there grows up another which is less distinctly admitted, and indeed held rather implicitly than consciously, that the majority is right. And out of both of these there grows again the feeling, still less consciously held, but not less truly operative, that it is vain to oppose or censure the majority.

It may seem that there is a long step from the first of these propositions to the second and third; and that, in fact, the very existence of a minority striving with a majority implies that there must be many who hold the majority to be wrong, and are prepared to resist it. Men do not at once abandon their views because they have been outvoted; they reiterate their views, they reorganize their party, they hope to prevail, and often do prevail in a subsequent trial of strength.

All this is doubtless involved in the very methods of popular government. But it is, nevertheless, true that the belief in the right of the majority lies very near to the belief that the majority must be right. As self-government is based on the notion that each man is more likely to be right than to be wrong, and that one man's opinion must be treated as equally good with another's, there is a presumption that when twenty thousand vote one way, and twenty-one thousand another, the view of the greater number is the better view. The habit of deference to a decision actually given strengthens this presumption, and weaves it into the texture of every mind. A conscientious citizen feels that he ought to obey the determination of the majority, and naturally prefers to think that which he obeys to be right. A citizen languidly interested in the question at issue finds it easier to comply with and adopt the view of the majority than to hold out against it. A small number of men with strong convictions or warm party feeling will, for a time, resist. But even they feel differently towards their cause after it has been defeated from what they did while it had still a prospect of success. They know that in the same proportion in which their supporters are dismayed, the majority is emboldened and confirmed in its views. It will be harder to fight a second battle than it was to fight the first, for there is (so to speak) a steeper slope of popular disapproval to be climbed. Thus, just as at the opening of a campaign, the event of the first collisions between the hostile armies has

great significance, because the victory of one is taken as an omen and a presage by both, so in the struggles of parties success at an incidental election works powerfully to strengthen those who succeed, and depress those who fail, for it inspires self-confidence or self-distrust, and it turns the minds of waverers. The very obscurity of the causes which move opinion adds significance to the result. So in the United States, when the elections in any State precede by a few weeks a presidential contest, their effect has sometimes been so great as virtually to determine that contest by filling one side with hope and the other with despondency. Those who prefer to swim with the stream are numerous everywhere, and their votes have as much weight as the votes of the keenest partisans. A man of convictions may insist that the arguments on both sides are after the polling just what they were before. But the average man will repeat his arguments with less faith, less zeal, more of a secret fear that he may be wrong, than he did while the majority was still doubtful; and after every reassertion by the majority of its judgment, his knees grow feebler, till at last they refuse to carry him into the combat.

The larger the scale on which the majority works, the more potent are these tendencies. When the scene of action is a small commonwealth, the individual voters are many of them personally known to one another, and the motives which determine their votes are understood and discounted. When it is a moderately-sized country, the towns or districts which compose it are not too numerous for reckoning to overtake and imagination to picture them, and in many cases their action can be explained by well-known causes which may be represented as transitory. But when the theatre stretches itself to a continent, when the number of voters is counted by many millions, the wings of imagination droop, and the huge voting mass ceases to be thought of as merely so many individual human beings no wiser or better than one's own neighbours. The phenomenon seems to pass into the category of the phenomena of nature, governed by far-reaching and inexorable laws whose character science has only imperfectly ascertained, and which she can use only by obeying. It inspires a sort of awe, a sense of individual impotence, like that which man feels when he contemplates the majestic and eternal forces of the

inanimate world. Such a feeling is even stronger when it operates, not on a cohesive minority which had lately hoped, or may yet hope, to become a majority, but on a single man or small group of persons cherishing some opinion which the mass disapproves. Thus out of the mingled feelings that the multitude will prevail, and that the multitude, because it will prevail, must be right, there grows a self-distrust, a despondency, a disposition to fall into line, to acquiesce in the dominant opinion, to submit thought as well as action to the encompassing power of numbers. Now and then a resolute man will, like Athanasius, stand alone against the world. But such a man must have, like Athanasius, some special spring of inward strength; and the difficulty of winning over others against the overwhelming weight of the multitude will, even in such a man, dull the edge of enterprise. An individual seeking to make his view prevail, looks forth on his hostile fellow-countrymen as a solitary swimmer, raised high on a billow miles from land, looks over the countless waves that divide him from the shore, and quails to think how small the chance that his strength can bear him thither.

This tendency to acquiescence and submission, this sense of the insignificance of individual effort, this belief that the affairs of men are swayed by large forces whose movement may be studied but cannot be turned, I have ventured to call the Fatalism of the Multitude. It is often confounded with the tyranny of the majority, but is at bottom different, though, of course, its existence makes abuses of power by the majority easier, because less apt to be resented. But the fatalistic attitude I have been seeking to describe does not imply any exercise of power by the majority at all. It may rather seem to soften and make less odious such an exercise of power, may even dispense with that exercise, because it disposes a minority to submit without the need of a command, to spontaneously renounce its own view and fall in with the view which the majority has expressed. In the fatalism of the multitude there is neither legal nor moral compulsion; there is merely a loss of resisting power, a diminished sense of personal responsibility, and of the duty to battle for one's own opinions, such as has been bred in some peoples by the belief in an overmastering fate. It is true that the force to which the citizen of

the vast democracy submits is a moral force, not that of an unapproachable Allah, nor of the unchangeable laws of matter. But it is a moral force acting on so vast a scale, and from causes often so obscure, that its effect on the mind of the individual may well be compared with that which religious or scientific fatalism engenders.

No one will suppose that the above sketch is intended to apply literally to the United States, where in some matters legal restrictions check a majority, where local self-government gives the humblest citizen a sphere for public action, where individualism is still in many forms and directions so vigorous. An American explorer, an American settler in new lands, an American man of business pushing a great enterprise, is a being as bold and resourceful as the world has ever seen. All I seek to convey is that there are in the United States signs of such a fatalistic temper, signs which one must expect to find wherever a vast population governs itself under a system of complete social and political equality, and which may grow more frequent as time goes on.

There exist in the American Republic several conditions which specially tend to create such a temper.

One of these is the unbounded freedom of discussion. Every view, every line of policy, has its fair chance before the people. No one can say that audience has been denied him, and comfort himself with the hope that, when he is heard, the world will come round to him. Under a repressive government, the sense of grievance and injustice feeds the flame of resistance in a persecuted minority. But in a country like this, where the freedom of the press, the right of public meeting, and the right of association and agitation have been legally extended and are daily exerted, more widely than anywhere else in the world, there is nothing to awaken that sense. He whom the multitude condemns or ignores has no further court of appeal to look to. Rome has spoken. His cause has been heard and judgment has gone against him.

Another is the intense faith which the Americans have in the soundness of their institutions, and in the future of their country. Foreign critics have said that they think themselves the special objects of the care of Divine Providence. If this be so, it is matter neither for surprise nor for sarcasm. They

are a religious people. They are trying, and that on the largest scale, the most remarkable experiment in government the world has yet witnessed. They have more than once been surrounded by perils which affrighted the stoutest hearts, and they have escaped from these perils into peace and prosperity. There is among pious persons a deep conviction — one may often hear it expressed on platforms and from pulpits with evident sincerity — that God has specially chosen the nation to work out a higher type of civilization than any other State has yet attained, and that this great work will surely be brought to a happy issue by the protecting hand that has so long guided it. And, even when the feeling does not take a theological expression, the belief in what is called the "Mission of the Republic" for all humanity is scarcely less ardent. But the foundation of the Republic is confidence in the multitude, in its honesty and good sense, in the certainty of its arriving at right conclusions. Pessimism is the luxury of a handful; optimism is the private delight, as well as public profession, of nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand, for nowhere does the individual associate himself more constantly and directly with the greatness of his country.

Now, such a faith in the people, and in the forces that sway them, disposes a man to acquiescence and submission. He cannot long hold that he is right and the multitude wrong. He cannot suppose that the country will ultimately suffer because it refuses to adopt what he urges upon it. As he comes of an energetic stock, he will use all proper means to state his views, and give them every chance of prevailing. But he submits more readily than an Englishman would do, ay, even to what an Englishman would think an injury to his private rights. When his legal right has been infringed, an American will confidently proceed to enforce at law his claim to redress, knowing that even against the government a just cause will prevail. But if he fails at law, the sense of his individual insignificance will still his voice. It may seem a trivial illustration to observe that when a railway train is late, or a waggon drawn up opposite a warehouse door stops the horse-car for five minutes, the passengers take the delay far more coolly and uncomplainingly than Englishmen would do. But the feeling is the same as that which makes good citizens bear with the tyranny of

Bosses. It is all in the course of nature. Others submit; why should one man resist? What is he that he should make a fuss because he loses a few minutes, or is taxed too highly? The sense of the immense multitude around him presses down the individual; and, after all, he reflects, "things will come out right" in the end.

It is hard adequately to convey the impression which the vastness of the country and the swift growth of its population make upon the European visitor. I well remember how it once came on me after climbing a high mountain in an Eastern State. All around was thick forest; but the setting sun lit up peaks sixty or seventy miles away, and flashed here and there on the windings of some river past a town so far off as to seem only a spot of white. I opened my map, a large map, which I had to spread upon the rocks to examine, and tried to make out, as one would have done in Scotland or Switzerland, the points in the view. The map, however, was useless, because the whole area of the landscape beneath me covered only two or three square inches upon it. From such a height in Scotland the eye would have ranged from sea to sea. But here when one tried to reckon how many more equally wide stretches of landscape lay between this peak and the Mississippi, which is itself only a third of the way across the continent, the calculation seemed endless and was soon abandoned. Many an Englishman comes by middle life to know nearly all England like a glove. He has travelled on all the great railroads; there is hardly a large town in which he has not acquaintances, hardly a county whose scenery is not familiar to him. But no American can be familiar with more than a small part of his country, for his country is a continent. And all Americans live their life through under the sense of this prodigious and daily growing multitude around them, which seems vaster the more you travel, and the more you realize its uniformity.

We need not here inquire whether the fatalistic attitude I have sought to sketch is the source of more good or evil. It seems at any rate inevitable: nor does it fail to produce a sort of pleasure for what the individual loses as an individual he seems in a measure to regain as one of the multitude. If the individual is not strong, he is at any rate as strong as any one else. His will counts for as much as any other will. He is

verborne by no superiority. Most men are fitter to make part f the multitude than to strive against it. Obedience is to ıost sweeter than independence; the Roman Catholic Church ıspires in its children a stronger affection than any form of 'rotestantism, for she takes their souls in charge, and assures ıem that, with obedience, all will be well.

That which we are presently concerned to note is how greatly ıch a tendency as I have described facilitates the action of pinion as a governing power, enabling it to prevail more wiftly and more completely than in countries where men have ot yet learned to regard the voice of the multitude as the oice of fate. Many submit willingly; some unwillingly, yet ıey submit. Rarely does any one hold out and venture to tell ıe great majority of his countrymen that they are wrong.

Moreover, public opinion acquires a solidity which strengthıs the whole body politic. Questions on which the masses ave made up their minds pass out of the region of practical iscussion. Controversy is confined to minor topics, and howver vehemently it may rage over these, it disturbs the great nderlying matters of agreement no more than a tempest stirs ıe depths of the Atlantic. Public order becomes more easily aintained, because individuals and small groups have learned submit even when they feel themselves aggrieved. The man ho murmurs against the world, who continues to preach a opeless cause, incurs contempt, and is apt to be treated as a ort of lunatic. He who is too wise to murmur and too proud go on preaching to unheeding ears comes to think that if s doctrine is true, yet the time is not ripe for it. He may be error; but if he is right, the world will ultimately see that e is right even without his effort. One way or another he nds it hard to believe that this vast mass and force of popular ought in which he lives and moves can be ultimately wrong. *ecurus iudicat orbis terrarum.*

CHAPTER LXXXVI

WHEREIN PUBLIC OPINION FAILS

WITHOUT anticipating the criticism of democratic government to be given in a later chapter, we may wind up the examination of public opinion by considering what are its merits as a governing and overseeing power, and, on the other hand, what defects, due either to inherent weakness or to the want of appropriate machinery, prevent it from attaining the ideal which the Americans have set before themselves. I begin with the defects.

The obvious weakness of government by opinion is the difficulty of ascertaining it. English administrators in India lament the impossibility of learning the sentiments of the natives, because in the East the populations, the true masses, are dumb. The press is written by a handful of persons who, in becoming writers, have ceased to belong to the multitude, and the multitude does not read. The difficulties of Western statesmen are due to an opposite cause. The populations are highly articulate. Such is the din of voices that it is hard to say which cry prevails, which is swelled by many, which only by a few throats. The organs of opinion seem almost as numerous as the people themselves, and they are all engaged in representing their own view as that of "the people." Like other valuable articles, genuine opinion is surrounded by counterfeits. The one positive test applicable is that of an election, and an election can at best do no more than test the division of opinion between two or three great parties, leaving subsidiary issues uncertain, while in many cases the result depends so much on the personal merits of the candidates as to render interpretation difficult. An American statesman is in no danger of consciously running counter to public opinion, but how is he to discover whether any particular opinion is making or losing

way, how is he to gauge the voting strength its advocates can put forth, or the moral authority its advocates can exert? Elections cannot be further multiplied, for they are too numerous already. The *referendum*, or plan of submitting a specific question to the popular vote, is the logical resource, but it is troublesome and costly to take the votes of millions of people over an area so large as that of one of the greater States; much more then is the method difficult to apply in Federal matters. This is the first drawback to the rule of public opinion. The choice of persons for offices is only an indirect and often unsatisfactory way of declaring views of policy, and as the elections at which such choices are made come at fixed intervals, time is lost in waiting for the opportunity of delivering the popular judgment.

The framers of the American Constitution may not have perceived that in labouring to produce a balance, as well between the National and State governments as between the Executive and Congress, in weakening each single authority in the government by dividing powers and functions among each of them, they were throwing upon the nation at large, that is, upon unorganized public opinion, more work than it had ever discharged in England, or could duly discharge in a country so divided by distances and jealousies as the United States then were. Distances and jealousies have been lessened. But as the progress of democracy has increased the self-distrust and submission to the popular voice of legislators, so the defects incident to a system of restrictions and balances have been aggravated. Thus the difficulty inherent in government by public opinion makes itself seriously felt. It can express desires, but has not the machinery for turning them into practical schemes. It can determine ends, but is less fit to examine and select means. Yet it has weakened the organs by which the business of finding appropriate means ought to be discharged.

American legislatures are bodies with limited powers and sitting for short terms. Their members are less qualified for the work of constructive legislation than are those of most European chambers. They are accustomed to consider themselves delegates from their respective States and districts, responsible to those districts, rather than councillors of the whole

nation labouring for its general interests; and they have no executive leaders, seeing that no official sits either in Congress or in a State legislature. Hence if at any time the people desire measures which do not merely repeal a law or direct an appropriation, but establish some administrative scheme, or mark out some positive line of financial policy, or provide some body of rules for dealing with such a topic as bankruptcy, railroad or canal communications, the management of public lands, and so forth, the people cannot count on having their wishes put into tangible workable shape. When members of Congress or of a State legislature think the country desires legislation, they begin to prepare bills, but the want of leadership and of constructive skill often prevents such bills from satisfying the needs of the case, and a timidity which fears to go beyond what opinion desires, may retard the accomplishment of the public wish; while, in the case of State legislatures, constructive skill is seldom present. Public opinion is slow and clumsy in grappling with large practical problems. It looks at them, talks incessantly about them, complains of Congress for not solving them, is distressed that they do not solve themselves. But they remain unsolved. Vital decisions have usually hung fire longer than they would have been likely to do in European countries. The war of 1812 seemed on the point of breaking out over and over again before it came at last. The absorption of Texas was a question of many years. The Extension of Slavery question came before the nation in 1819; after 1840 it was the chief source of trouble; year by year it grew more menacing; year by year the nation was seen more clearly to be drifting towards the breakers. Everybody felt that something must be done. But it was the function of no one authority in particular to discover a remedy, as it would have been the function of a cabinet in Europe. I do not say the sword might not in any case have been invoked, for the temperature of Southern feeling had been steadily rising to war point. But the history of 1840–60 leaves an impression of the dangers which may result from fettering the constitutional organs of government, and trusting to public sentiment to bring things right. Some other national questions, less dangerous, but serious, are now in the same condition. The Currency question is an incessant source of disquiet. The question of reducing the surplus

national revenue puzzled statesmen and the people at large longer than a similar question would be suffered to do in Europe, and when solved in 1890 by the passage of the Dependent Pension bill, was solved to the public injury in a purely demagogic or electioneering spirit. I doubt whether any European legislature would have so openly declined the duty of considering the interests of the country, and abandoned itself so undisguisedly to the pursuit of the votes of a particular section of the population. And the same thing holds, *mutatis mutandis*, of State governments. In them also there is no set of persons whose special duty it is to find remedies for admitted evils. The structure of the government provides the requisite machinery neither for forming nor for guiding a popular opinion, disposed of itself to recognize only broad and patent facts, and to be swayed only by such obvious reasons as it needs little reflection to follow. Admirable practical acuteness, admirable ingenuity in inventing and handling machinery, whether of iron and wood or of human beings, coexist, in the United States, with an aversion to the investigation of general principles as well as trains of systematic reasoning.[1] The liability to be caught by fallacies, the inability to recognize facts which are not seen but must be inferentially found to exist, the incapacity to imagine a future which must result from the unchecked operation of present forces, these are indeed the defects of the ordinary citizen in all countries, and if they are conspicuous in America, it is only because the ordinary citizen, who is more intelligent there than elsewhere, is also more potent.

It may be replied to these observations, which are a criticism as well upon the American frame of government as upon public opinion, that the need for constructive legislation is small in America, because the habit of the country is to leave things to themselves. This is not really the fact. A great State has always problems of administration to deal with; these problems do not become less grave as time runs on, and the hand of government is beginning to-day to be invoked in

[1] To say this is not to ignore the influence exercised on the national mind by the "glittering generalities" of the Declaration of Independence; nor the theoretical grounds taken up for and against State Rights and Slavery, and specially the highly logical scheme excogitated by Calhoun.

America for many purposes thought to be of common utility with which legislation did not formerly intermeddle.

There is more force in the remark that we must remember how much is gained as well as lost by the slow and hesitating working of public opinion in the United States. So tremendous a force would be dangerous if it moved rashly. Acting over and gathered from an enormous area, in which there exist many local differences, it needs time, often a long time, to become conscious of the preponderance of one set of tendencies over another. The elements both of local difference and of class difference must be (so to speak) well shaken up together, and each part brought into contact with the rest, before the mixed liquid can produce a precipitate in the form of a practical conclusion. And in this is seen the difference between the excellence as a governing power of opinion in the whole Union, and opinion within the limits of a particular State. The systems of constitutional machinery by which public sentiment acts are similar in the greater and in the smaller area; the constitutional maxims practically identical. But public opinion, which moves slowly, and, as a rule, temperately, in the field of national affairs, is sometimes hasty and reckless in State affairs. The population of a State may be of one colour, as that of the North-western States is preponderatingly agricultural, or may contain few persons of education and political knowledge, or may fall under the influence of a demagogue or a clique, or may be possessed by some local passion. Thus its opinion may want breadth, sobriety, wisdom, and the result be seen in imprudent or unjust measures. The latest constitution of California, the Granger legislation of Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin, the tampering with their public debts by several States, are familiar instances of follies, to use no harder name, which local opinion approved, but which would have been impossible in the Federal government, where the controlling opinion is that of a large and complex nation, and where the very deficiencies of one section or one class serve to correct qualities which may exist in excess in some other.

The sentiment of the nation at large, being comparatively remote, acts but slowly in restraining the vagaries or curing the faults of one particular State. The dwellers on the Pacific coast care very little for the criticism of the rest of the coun-

try on their anti-Chinese violence; Pennsylvania and Virginia disregarded the best opinions of the Union when they so dealt with their debts as to affect their credit; those parts of the South in which homicide goes unpunished, except by the relatives of the slain, are unmoved by the reproaches and jests of the more peaceable and well-regulated States. The fact shows how deep the division of the country into self-governing commonwealths goes, making men feel that they have a right to do what they will with their own, so long as the power remains to them, whatever may be the purely moral pressure from those who, though they can advise, have no title to interfere. And it shows also, in the teeth of the old doctrine that republicanism was fit only for small communities, that evils peculiar to a particular district, which might be ruinous in that district if it stood alone, become less dangerous when it forms part of a vast country.

We may go on to ask how far American opinion succeeds in the simpler duty, which opinion must discharge in all countries, of supervising the conduct of business, and judging the current legislative work which Congress and other legislatures turn out.

Here again the question turns not so much on the excellence of public opinion as on the adequacy of the constitutional machinery provided for its action. That supervision and criticism may be effective, it must be easy to fix on particular persons the praise for work well done, the blame for work neglected or ill-performed. Experience shows that good men are the better for a sense of their responsibility and ordinary men useless without it. The free governments of Europe and the British colonies have gone on the principle of concentrating power in order to be able to fix responsibility. The American plan of dividing powers, eminent as are its other advantages, makes it hard to fix responsibility. The executive can usually allege that it had not received from the legislature the authority necessary to enable it to grapple with a difficulty; while in the legislature there is no one person or group of persons on whom the blame due for that omission or refusal can be laid. Suppose some gross dereliction of duty to have occurred. The people are indignant. A victim is wanted, who, for the sake of the example to others, ought to be found and

punished, either by law or by general censure. But perhaps he cannot be found, because out of several persons or bodies who have been concerned, it is hard to apportion the guilt and award the penalty. Where the sin lies at the door of Congress, it is not always possible to arraign either the Speaker or the dominant majority, or any particular party leader. Where a State legislature or a city council has misconducted itself, the difficulty is still greater, because party ties are less strict in such a body, proceedings are less fully reported, and both parties are apt to be equally implicated in the abuses of private legislation. Not uncommonly there is presented the sight of an exasperated public going about like a roaring lion, seeking whom it may devour, and finding no one. The results in State affairs would be much worse were it not for the existence of the governor with his function of vetoing bills, because in many cases, knowing that he can be made answerable for the passage of a bad measure, he is forced up to the level of a virtue beyond that of the natural man in politics. And the disposition to seek a remedy for municipal misgovernment in increasing the powers of the mayor illustrates the same principle.

Although the failures of public opinion in overseeing the conduct of its servants are primarily due to the want of appropriate machinery, they are increased by its characteristic temper. Quick and strenuous in great matters, it is heedless in small matters, over-kindly and indulgent in all matters. It suffers weeds to go on growing till they have struck deep root. It has so much to do in looking after both Congress and its State legislature, a host of executive officials, and perhaps a city council also, that it may impartially tolerate the misdoings of all till some important issue arises. Even when jobs are exposed by the press, each particular job seems below the attention of a busy people or the anger of a good-natured people, till the sum total of jobbery becomes a scandal. To catch and to hold the attention of the people is the chief difficulty as well as the first duty of an American reformer.

The long-suffering tolerance of public opinion towards incompetence and misconduct in officials and public men generally, is a feature which has struck recent European observers. It is the more remarkable because nowhere is executive ability

more valued in the management of private concerns, in which the stress of competition forces every manager to secure at whatever price the most able subordinates. We may attribute it partly to the good nature of the people, which makes them over-lenient to nearly all criminals, partly to the preoccupation with their private affairs of the most energetic and useful men, who therefore cannot spare time to unearth abuses and get rid of offenders, partly to an indifference induced by the fatalistic sentiment which I have already sought to describe. This fatalism acts in two ways. Being optimistic, it disposes each man to believe that things will come out right whether he "takes hold" himself or not, and that it is therefore no great matter whether a particular Ring or Boss is suppressed. And in making each individual man feel his insignificance, it disposes him to leave to the multitude the task of setting right what is every one else's business just as much as his own. An American does not smart under the same sense of personal wrong from the mismanagement of his public business, from the exaction of high city taxes and their malversation, as an Englishman would in the like case. If he suffers, he consoles himself by thinking that he suffers with others, as part of the general order of things, which he is no more called upon to correct than are his neighbours.

It may be charged as a weak point in the rule of public opinion, that by fostering this habit it has chilled activity and dulled the sense of responsibility among the leaders in political life. It has made them less eager and strenuous in striking out ideas and plans of their own, less bold in propounding those plans, more sensitive to the reproach, even more feared in America than in England, of being a crotchet-monger or a doctrinaire. That new or unpopular ideas are more frequently started by isolated thinkers, economists, social reformers, than by statesmen, may be set down to the fact that practical statesmanship indisposes men to theorizing. But in America the practical statesman is apt to be timid in advocacy as well as infertile in suggestion. He seems to be always listening for the popular voice, always afraid to commit himself to a view which may turn out unpopular. It is a fair conjecture that this may be due to his being by his profession a far more habitual worshipper as well as observer of public opinion, than will be

the case with men who are by profession thinkers and students, men who are less purely Americans of to-day, because under the influence of the literature as well of past times as of contemporary Europe. Philosophy, taking the word to include the historical study of the forces which work upon mankind at large, is needed by a statesman not only as a consolation for the disappointments of his career, but as a corrective to the superstitions and tremors which the service of the multitude implants.

The enormous force of public opinion is a danger to the people themselves, as well as their leaders. It no longer makes them tyrannical. But it fills them with an undue confidence in their wisdom, their virtue, and their freedom. It may be thought that a nation which uses freedom well can hardly have too much freedom; yet even such a nation may be too much inclined to think freedom an absolute and all-sufficient good, to seek truth only in the voice of the majority, to mistake prosperity for greatness. Such a nation, seeing nothing but its own triumphs, and hearing nothing but its own praises, seems to need a succession of men like the prophets of Israel to rouse the people out of their self-complacency, to refresh their moral ideals, to remind them that the life is more than meat, and the body more than raiment, and that to whom much is given of them shall much also be required. If America has no prophets of this order, she fortunately possesses two classes of men who maintain a wholesome irritation such as that which Socrates thought it his function to apply to the Athenian people. These are the instructed critics who exert a growing influence on opinion through the higher newspapers and by literature generally, and the philanthropic reformers who tell more directly upon the multitude, particularly through the churches. Both classes combined may not as yet be doing all that is needed. But the significant point is that their influence represents not an ebbing, but a flowing tide. If the evils they combat exist on a larger scale than in past times, they too, are more active and more courageous in rousing and reprehending their fellow-countrymen.

CHAPTER LXXXVII

WHEREIN PUBLIC OPINION SUCCEEDS

In the examination of the actualities of politics as well as of rms of government, faults are more readily perceived than erits. Everybody is struck by the mistakes which a ruler akes, or by evils which a constitution fails to avert, while ss praise than is due may be bestowed in respect of the mptations that have been resisted, or the prudence with hich the framers of the government have avoided defects om which other countries suffer. Thus the general prosper- y of the United States and the success of their people in all nds of private enterprises, philanthropic as well as gainful, rows into relief the blemishes of their government, and akes it the more necessary to point out in what respects the wer of public opinion overcomes those blemishes, and main- ins a high level of good feeling and well-being in the nation. The European observer of the working of American institu- ns is apt to sum up his conclusions in two contrasts. One between the excellence of the Constitution and the vices of e party system that has laid hold of it, discovered its weak ints, and brought in a swarm of evils. The Fathers, he says, eated the Constitution good, but their successors have sought t many inventions. The other contrast is between the faults the political class and the merits of the people at large. he men who work the Machine are often selfish and unscru- lous. The people, for whose behoof it purports to be worked, d who suffer themselves to be "run" by the politicians, are nest, intelligent, fair-minded. No such contrast exists any- here else in the world. Either the politicians are better an they are in America, or the people are worse.

The causes of this contrast, which to many observers has emed the capital fact of American politics, have been already

explained. It brings out the truth, on which too much stres cannot be laid, that the strong point of the American systen the dominant fact of the situation, is the healthiness of publi opinion, and the control which it exerts. As Abraham Lin coln said in his famous contest with Douglas, "With publi sentiment on its side, everything succeeds; with public sent ment against it, nothing succeeds."

The conscience and common sense of the nation as a whol keep down the evils which have crept into the working of th Constitution, and may in time extinguish them. Public opin ion is a sort of atmosphere, fresh, keen, and full of sunlight like that of the American cities, and this sunlight kills man of those noxious germs which are hatched where politician congregate. That which, varying a once famous phrase, w may call the genius of universal publicity, has some disagree able results, but the wholesome ones are greater and mor numerous. Selfishness, injustice, cruelty, tricks, and jobs o all sorts shun the light; to expose them is to defeat them No serious evils, no rankling sore in the body politic, can re main long concealed, and when disclosed, it is half destroyed So long as the opinion of a nation is sound, the main lines o its policy cannot go far wrong, whatever waste of time an money may be incurred in carrying them out. It was observe in the last chapter that opinion is too vague and indeterminat a thing to be capable of considering and selecting the bes means for the end on which it has determined. The counte part of that remark is that the opinion of a whole nation, united and tolerably homogeneous nation, is, when at last does express itself, the most competent authority to determi the ends of national policy.[1] In European countries, legisl tures and cabinets sometimes take decisions which the natio which had scarcely thought of the matter till the decision ha been taken, is ultimately found to disapprove. In Americ men feel that the nation is the only power entitled to say wh

[1] The distinction between means and ends is, of course, one which it is ha to draw in practice, because most ends are means to some larger end whi embraces them. Still if we understand by ends the main and leading obje of national policy, including the spirit in which the government ought to administered, we shall find that these are, if sometimes slowly, yet more clea apprehended in America than in Europe, and less frequently confounded w subordinate and transitory issues.

wants, and that, till it has manifested its wishes, nothing ust be done to commit it. It may sometimes be long in eaking, but when it speaks, it speaks with a weight which e wisest governing class cannot claim.

The frame of the American government has assumed and usted to the activity of public opinion, not only as the power nich must correct and remove the difficulties due to the re-rictions imposed on each department, and to possible colli-ons between them, but as the influence which must supply the ffects incidental to a system which works entirely by the achinery of popular elections. Under a system of elections e man's vote is as good as another, the vicious and ignorant ve as much weight as the wise and good. A system of elec-ons might be imagined which would provide no security for e deliberation or full discussion, a system which, while dem-ratic in name, recognizing no privilege, and referring every-ing to the vote of the majority, would in practice be hasty, olent, tyrannical. It is with such a possible democracy that e has to contrast the rule of public opinion as it exists in the nited States. Opinion declares itself legally through elec-ns. But opinion is at work at other times also, and has ner methods of declaring itself. It secures full discussion of ues of policy and of the characters of men. It suffers noth-g to be concealed. It listens patiently to all the arguments at are addressed to it. Eloquence, education, wisdom, the thority derived from experience and high character, tell on it in the long run, and have, perhaps not always their e influence, but yet a great and growing influence. Thus a nocracy governing itself through a constantly active public inion, and not solely by its intermittent mechanism of elec-ns, tends to become patient, tolerant, reasonable, and is more ely to be unembittered and unvexed by class divisions.

It is the existence of such a public opinion as this, the prac-e of freely and constantly reading, talking, and judging of olic affairs with a view to voting thereon, rather than the re possession of political rights, that gives to popular gov-ment that educative and stimulative power which is so fre-ently claimed as its highest merit. Those who, in the last neration, were forced to argue for democratic government ainst oligarchies or despots, were perhaps inclined, if not to

exaggerate the value of extended suffrage and a powerful legislature, at least to pass too lightly over the concomitant conditions by whose help such institutions train men to use liberty well. History does not support the doctrine that the mere enjoyment of power fits large masses of men, any more than individuals or classes, for its exercise. Along with that enjoyment there must be found some one or more of various auspicious conditions, such as a direct and fairly equal interest in the common welfare, the presence of a class or group of persons respected and competent to guide, an absence of religious or race hatreds, a high level of education or at least of intelligence, old habits of local self-government, the practice of unlimited free discussion. In America it is not simply the habit of voting, but the briskness and breeziness of the whole atmosphere of public life, and the process of obtaining information and discussing it, of hearing and judging each side, that form the citizen's intelligence. True it is that he would gain less from this process if it did not lead up to the exercise of voting power: he would not learn so much on the road did not the polling-booth stand at the end of it. But if it were his lot, as it is that of the masses in some European countries, to exercise his right of suffrage under few of these favouring conditions, the educational value of the vote would become comparatively small. It is the habit of breathing as well as helping to form public opinion that cultivates, develops, trains the average American. It gives him a sense of personal responsibility stronger, because more constant, than exists in those free countries of Europe where he commits his power to a legislature. Sensible that his eye ought to be always fixed on the conduct of affairs, he grows accustomed to read and judge, not indeed profoundly, sometimes erroneously, usually under party influences, but yet with a feeling that the judgment is his own. He has a sense of ownership in the government, and therewith a kind of independence of manner as well as of mind very different from the demissness of the humbler classes of the Old World. And the consciousness of responsibility which goes along with this laudable pride, brings forth the peaceable fruits of moderation. As the Greeks thought that the old families ruled their households more gently than upstarts did, so citizens who have been born to power, born

nto an atmosphere of legal right and constitutional authority, are sobered by their privileges. Despite their natural quickness and eagerness, the native Americans are politically patient. They are disposed to try soft means first, to expect others to bow to that force of opinion which they themselves recognize. Opposition does not incense them; danger does not, by making them lose their heads, hurry them into precipitate courses. In no country does a beaten minority take a defeat so well. Admitting that the blood of the race counts for something in producing that peculiar coolness and self-control in the midst of an external effervescence of enthusiasm, which is the most distinctive feature of the American masses, the habit of ruling by public opinion and obeying it counts for even more. It was far otherwise in the South before the war, but the South was not a democracy, and its public opinion was that of a passionate class.

The best evidence for this view is to be found in the educative influence of opinion on new-comers. Any one can see how severe a strain is put on democratic institutions by the influx every year of half a million of untrained Europeans, not to speak of those French Canadians who now settle in the North-eastern States. Being in most States admitted to full civic rights before they have come to shake off European notions and habits, these strangers enjoy political power before they either share or are amenable to American opinion. Such immigrants are at first not merely a dead weight in the ship, but a weight which party managers can, in city politics, so shift as to go near upsetting her. They follow blindly leaders of their own race, are not moved by discussion, exercise no judgment of their own. This lasts for some years, probably for the rest of life with those who are middle-aged when they arrive. It lasts also with those who remain herded together in large masses, and makes them a dangerous element in manufacturing and mining districts. But the younger sort, when, if they be foreigners, they have learnt English, and when, dispersed among Americans so as to be able to learn from them, they have imbibed the sentiments and ideas of the country, are thenceforth scarcely to be distinguished from the native population. They are more American than the Americans in their desire to put on the character of their new country. This peculiar gift which

the Republic possesses, of quickly dissolving and assimilating the foreign bodies that are poured into her, imparting to them her own qualities of orderliness, good sense, self-restraint, a willingness to bow to the will of the majority, is mainly due to the all-pervading force of opinion, which the new-comer, so soon as he has formed social and business relations with the natives, breathes in daily till it insensibly transmutes him. Their faith, and a sentiment of resentment against England, keep up among the Irish a body of separate opinion, which for a time resists the solvent power of its American environment. But the public schools finish the work of the factory and the newspapers. The Irish immigrant's son is an American citizen for all other purposes, even if he retain, which he sometimes unfortunately does, the hereditary Anglophobia.

It is chiefly the faith in publicity that gives to the American public their peculiar buoyancy, and what one may call their airy hopefulness in discussing even the weak points of their system. They are always telling you that they have no skeleton closets, nothing to keep back. They know, and are content that all the world should know, the worst as well as the best of themselves. They have a boundless faith in free inquiry and full discussion. They admit the possibility of any number of temporary errors and delusions. But to suppose that a vast nation should, after hearing everything, canvassing everything, and trying all the preliminary experiments it has a mind to, ultimately go wrong by mistaking its own true interests, seems to them a sort of blasphemy against the human intelligence and its Creator.

They claim for opinion that its immense power enables them to get on with but little government. Some evils which the law and its officers are in other countries required to deal with are here averted or cured by the mere force of opinion, which shrivels them up when its rays fall on them. As it is not the product of any one class, and is unwilling to recognize classes at all, for it would stand self-condemned as un-American if it did, it discourages anything in the nature of class legislation. Where a particular section of the people, such, for instance, as the Western farmers or the Eastern operatives, think themselves aggrieved, they clamour for the measures thought likely to help them. The farmers legislated against the railroads, the labour

party asks an eight-hour law. But whereas on the European continent such a class would think and act as a class, hostile to other classes, and might resolve to pursue its own objects at whatever risk to the nation, in America national opinion, which every one recognizes as the arbiter, mitigates these feelings, and puts the advocates of the legislation which any class demands upon showing that their schemes are compatible with the paramount interest of the whole community. To say that there is no legislation in America which, like the class legislation of Europe, has thrown undue burdens on the poor, while jealously guarding the pleasures and pockets of the rich, is to say little, because where the poorer citizens have long been a numerical majority, invested with political power, they will evidently take care of themselves. But the opposite danger might have been feared, that the poor would have turned the tables on the rich, thrown the whole burden of taxation upon them, and disregarded in the supposed interest of the masses what are called the rights of property. Not only has this not been attempted — it has been scarcely even suggested (except, of course, by socialists from Europe), and it excites no serious apprehension. There is nothing in the machinery of government that could do more than delay it for a time, did the masses desire it. What prevents it is the honesty and common sense of the citizens generally, who are convinced that the interests of all classes are substantially the same, and that justice is the highest of those interests. Equality, open competition, a fair field to everybody, every stimulus to industry, and every security for its fruits, these they hold to be the self-evident principles of national prosperity.

If public opinion is heedless in small things, it usually checks measures which, even if not oppressive, are palpably selfish or unwise. If before a mischievous bill passes, its opponents can get the attention of the people fixed upon it, its chances are slight. All sorts of corrupt or pernicious schemes which are hatched at Washington or in the State legislatures are abandoned because it is felt that the people will not stand them, although they could be easily pushed through those not too scrupulous assemblies. There have been instances of proposals which took people at first by their plausibility, but which the criticism of opinion riddled with its unceasing fire till at last

they were quietly dropped. It was in this way that President Grant's attempt to annex San Domingo failed. He had made a treaty for the purpose, which fell through for want of the requisite two-thirds majority in the Senate, but he persisted in the scheme until at last the disapproval of the general public, which had grown stronger by degrees and found expression through the leading newspapers, warned him to desist. After the war, there was at first in many quarters a desire to punish the Southern leaders for what they had made the North suffer. But by degrees the feeling died away, the sober sense of the whole North restraining the passions of those who had counselled vengeance; and, as every one knows, there was never a civil war or rebellion, whichever one is to call it, followed by so few severities.

Public opinion often fails to secure the appointment of the best men to places, but where undivided responsibility can be fixed on the appointing authority, it prevents, as those who are behind the scenes know, countless bad appointments for which politicians intrigue. Considering the power of party managers over the Federal executive, and the low sense of honour and public duty as regards patronage among politicians, the leading posts are filled, if not by the most capable men, yet seldom by bad ones. The Federal judges, for instance, are, and have always been, men of high professional standing and stainless character. The same may be, though less generally, said of the upper Federal officials in the North and West. That no similar praise can be bestowed on the exercise of Federal patronage in the Southern States since the war, is an illustration of the view I am stating. As the public opinion of the South (that is to say, of the whites who make opinion there) has been steadily hostile to the Republican party, which commanded the executive during the twenty years from 1865 to 1885, the Republican party managers were indifferent to it because they had nothing to gain or to lose from it. Hence they made appointments without regard to it. Northern opinion knows comparatively little of the details of Southern politics and the character of officials who act there, so that they might hope to escape the censure of their supporters in the North. Hence they jobbed their patronage in the South with unblushing cynicism, using Federal posts there as a mean

not merely of rewarding party services, but also of providing local white leaders and organizers to the coloured Southern Republicans. Their different behaviour here and in the North therefore shows that it has not been public virtue, but the fear of public opinion, that has made their Northern appointments on the whole respectable, while those in the South have been so much the reverse. The same phenomenon has been noticed in Great Britain. Jobs are frequent and scandalous in the inverse ratio to the notice they are likely to attract.[1]

In questions of foreign policy, opinion is a valuable reserve force. When demonstrations are made by party leaders intended to capture the vote of some particular section, the native Americans only smile. But they watch keenly the language held and the acts done by the State Department (Foreign Office), and, while determined to support the President in vindicating the rights of American citizens, would be found ready to check any demand or act going beyond their legal rights which could tend to embroil them with a foreign power. There is still a touch of spread-eagleism and an occasional want of courtesy and taste among public speakers and journalists when they refer to other countries; and there is a determination in all classes to keep European interference at a distance. But among the ordinary native citizens one finds (I think) less obtrusive selfishness, less Chauvinism, less cynicism in declaring one's own national interests to be paramount to those of other States, than in any of the great States of Europe. Justice and equity are more generally recognized as binding upon nations no less than on individuals. Whenever humanity comes into question, the heart of the people is sound. The treatment of the Indians reflects little credit on the Western settlers who have come in contact with them, and almost as little on the Federal government, whose efforts to protect them have been often foiled by the faults of its own agents, or by its own want

[1] It has often been remarked that posts of the same class are more jobbed by the British executive in Scotland than in England, and in Ireland than in Scotland, because it is harder to rouse Parliament, which in Great Britain discharges much of the function which public opinion discharges in America, to any interest in an appointment made in one of the smaller countries. In Great Britain a minister making a bad appointment has to fear a hostile motion (though Parliament is over-lenient to jobs) which may displace him; in the United States a President is under no such apprehension. It is only to opinion that he is responsible.

of promptitude and foresight. But the wish of the people at large has always been to deal generously with the aborigines, nor have appeals on their behalf, such as those so persistently and eloquently made by the late Mrs. Helen Jackson, ever failed to command the sympathy and assent of the country.

Throughout these chapters I have been speaking chiefly of the Northern States and chiefly of the present, for America is a country which changes fast. But the conduct of the Southern people, since their defeat in 1865, illustrates the tendency of underlying national traits to reassert themselves when disturbing conditions have passed away. Before the war the public opinion of the Slave States, and especially of the planting States, was practically the opinion of a class, — the small and comparatively rich landowning aristocracy. The struggle for the defence of their institution had made this opinion fierce and intolerant. To a hatred of the Abolitionists, whom it thought actuated by the wish to rob and humiliate the South, it joined a misplaced contempt for what it deemed the money-grubbing and peace-at-any-price spirit of the Northern people generally. So long as the subjugated States were ruled by arms, and the former "rebels" excluded by disfranchisement from the government of their States, this bitterness remained. When the restoration of self-government, following upon the liberation of the Confederate prisoners and the amnesty, had shown the magnanimity of the North, its clemency, its wish to forget and forgive, its assumption that both sides would shake hands and do their best for their common country, the hearts of the Southern men were conquered. Opinion went round. Frankly, one might almost say cheerfully, it recognized the inevitable. It stopped those outrages on the negroes which the law had been unable to repress. It began to regain "touch" of, it has now almost fused itself with, the opinion of the North and West. No one Southern leader or group can be credited with this: it was the general sentiment of the people that brought it about. Still less do the Northern politicians deserve the praise of the peace-makers, for many among them tried for political purposes to fan or to rekindle the flame of suspicion in the North. It was the opinion of the North generally, more liberal than its guides, which dictated not merely forgiveness, but the restoration of

equal civic rights. Nor is this the only case in which the people have proved themselves to have a higher and a truer inspiration than the politicians.

It has been observed that the all-subduing power of the popular voice may tell against the appearance of great statesmen by dwarfing aspiring individualities, by teaching men to discover and obey the tendencies of their age rather than rise above them and direct them. If this happens in America, it is not because the American people fail to appreciate and follow and exalt such eminent men as fortune bestows upon it. It has a great capacity for loyalty, even for hero-worship. "Our people," said an experienced American publicist to me, "are in reality hungering for great men, and the warmth with which even pinchbeck geniuses, men who have anything showy or taking about them, anything that is deemed to betoken a strong individuality, are followed and glorified in spite of intellectual emptiness, and perhaps even moral shortcomings, is the best proof of the fact." Henry Clay was the darling of his party for many years, as Jefferson, with less of personal fascination, had been in the preceding generation. Daniel Webster retained the devotion of New England long after it had become clear that his splendid intellect was mated to a far from noble character. A kind of dictatorship was yielded to Abraham Lincoln, whose memory is cherished almost like that of Washington himself. Whenever a man appears with something taking or forcible about him, he becomes the object of so much popular interest and admiration that those cooler heads who perceive his faults, and perhaps dread his laxity of principle, reproach the proneness of their less discerning countrymen to make an idol out of wood or clay. The career of Andrew Jackson is a case in point, though it may be hoped that the intelligence of the people would estimate such a character more truly to-day than it did sixty years ago. I doubt if there be any country where a really brilliant man, confident in his own strength, and adding the charm of a striking personality to the gift of popular eloquence, would find an easier path to fame and power, and would exert more influence over the minds and emotions of the multitude. Such a man, speaking to the people with the independence of conscious strength, would find himself appreciated and respected.

Controversy is still bitter, more profuse in personal imputations than one expects to find it where there are no grave issues to excuse excitement. But in this respect also there is an improvement. Partisans are reckless, but the mass of the people lends itself less to acrid partisanship than it did in the time of Jackson, or in those first days of the Republic which were so long looked back to as a sort of heroic age. Public opinion grows more temperate, more mellow, and assuredly more tolerant. Its very strength disposes it to bear with opposition or remonstrance. It respects itself too much to wish to silence any voice.

PART V

ILLUSTRATIONS AND REFLECTIONS

[This Part contains some illustrations, drawn from recent American history, of the working of political institutions and public opinion, together with observations on several political questions for which no fitting place could be found in the preceding Parts.]

CHAPTER LXXXVIII

THE TAMMANY RING IN NEW YORK CITY

Although I have described in previous chapters the causes which have induced the perversion and corruption of democratic government in great American cities, it seems desirable to illustrate more fully, from the recent history of two of those cities, the conditions under which those causes work and the forms which that perversion takes. The phenomena of municipal democracy in the United States are the most remarkable and least laudable which the modern world has witnessed; and they present some evils which no political philosopher, however unfriendly to popular government, appears to have foreseen, evils which have scarcely showed themselves in the cities of Europe, and unlike those which were thought characteristic of the rule of the masses in ancient times. I take New York and Philadelphia as examples because they are older than Chicago, Brooklyn, and St. Louis, far larger than Boston and Baltimore. And I begin with New York, because she displays on the grandest scale phenomena common to American cities, and because the plunder and misgovernment from which she has suffered have become specially notorious over the world.

From the end of last century the State and (somewhat later) the city of New York were, more perhaps than any other State or city, the seat of intrigues and the battle-ground of factions. Party organizations early became powerful in them, and it was by a New York leader — Marcy, the friend of President Jackson, — that the famous doctrine of "the Spoils to the Victors" was first formulated as the practice of New York politicians. These factions were for a long time led, and these intrigues worked, by men belonging to the upper or middle class, to whom the emoluments of office were desirable but not essential. In the middle of the century, however, there came

a change. The old native population of the city was more and more swollen by the immigration of foreigners: first of the Irish, especially from 1846 onwards; then also of the Germans from 1849 onwards; finally of Polish and Russian Jews, as well as of Italians and of Slavs from about 1883 onwards. Already in 1870 the foreign population, including not only the foreign-born but a large part of their children who, though born in America, were still virtually Europeans, constituted a half or perhaps even a majority of the inhabitants; and the proportion of foreigners has since then varied but little.[1] These newcomers were as a rule poor and ignorant. They knew little of the institutions of the country, and had not acquired any patriotic interest in it. But they received votes. Their numbers soon made them a power in city and State politics, and all the more so because they were cohesive, influenced by leaders of their own race, and not, like the native voters, either disposed to exercise, or capable of exercising, an independent judgment upon current issues. From among them there soon emerged men whose want of book-learning was overcome by their natural force and shrewdness, and who became apt pupils in those arts of party management which the native professional politicians had already brought to perfection.

While these causes were transferring power to the rougher and more ignorant element in the population, the swift developments of trade which followed the making of the Erie Canal and opening up of railway routes to the West, with the consequent expansion of New York as a commercial and financial centre, had more and more distracted the thoughts of the wealthier people from local politics, which required more time than busy men could give, and seemed tame compared with that struggle over slavery, whereon, from 1850 to 1865, all patriotic minds were bent. The leading men, who fifty years earlier would have watched municipal affairs and perhaps

[1] In 1870 44 per cent of the population of New York were of foreign birth; in 1880, 39 per cent; in 1890, 42 per cent. The percentage of persons who were practically foreigners, as the sons of immigrants still imperfectly Americanized, was and is of course greater, because it must include many of the sons born in America of persons still imperfectly Americanized. It is true that some of the most recent immigrants had not yet obtained votes, but against this must be set the fact that the proportion of adults is much larger among the immigrants than in the whole population.

orne a part in them, were now so much occupied with their ommercial enterprises or their legal practice as to neglect heir local civic duties, and saw with unconcern the chief muni- ipal offices appropriated by persons belonging to the lower trata of society.

Even had these men of social position and culture desired to etain a hold in city politics, the task would not have been asy, for the rapid growth of New York, which from a popu- ation of 108,000 in 1820 had risen to 209,000 in 1830, to 13,000 in 1860, and to 942,000 in 1870, brought in swarms of trangers who knew nothing of the old residents, and it was nly by laboriously organizing these newcomers that they could e secured as adherents. However laborious the work might e, it was sure to be done, because the keenness of party strife ade every vote precious. But it was work not attractive to en of education, nor suited to them. It fell naturally to ose who themselves belonged to the lower strata, and it ecame the source of the power they acquired.

Among the political organizations of New York the oldest nd most powerful was the Tammany Society. It is as old as ne Federal government, having been established under the ame of the Columbian Society in 1789, just a fortnight after Vashington's inauguration, by an Irish American called Villiam Mooney, and its purposes were at first social and haritable rather than political. In 1805 it entitled itself the ammany Society, adopting, as is said, the name of an Indian hief called Tamanend or Tammany, and clothing itself with a ort of mock Indian character. There were thirteen tribes, ith twelve "sachems" under a grand sachem, a "sagamore" master of ceremonies, and a "wiskinski" or doorkeeper. y degrees, and as the story goes, under the malignant influ- ace of Aaron Burr, it took a strongly political tinge as its umbers increased. Already in 1812 it was a force in the city, aving become a rallying centre for what was then called the epublican and afterwards the Democratic party; but the ele- ent of moral aspiration does not seem to have become extinct, r in 1817 it issued an address deploring the spread of the reign game of billiards among young men of the upper classes. t one time, too, it possessed a sort of natural history museum, hich was ultimately purchased by the well-known showman,

P. T. Barnum. Till 1822 it had been governed by a genera meeting of its members, but with its increased size there cam a representative system; and though the Society proper con tinued to be governed and its property held by the "sachems, the control of the political organization became vested in general committee consisting of delegates elected at primar meetings throughout the city, which that organization wa now beginning to overspread. This committee, originall of thirty-three members, numbered seventy-five in 1836, b which time Tammany Hall had won its way to a predominan influence in city politics. Of the present organization I sha speak later.

The first sachems had been men of some social standing and almost entirely native Americans. The general demo cratization, which was unfortunately accompanied by a vulgar zation, of politics, that marked the time of Andrew Jackso lowered by degrees the character of city politicians, turnin them into mere professionals whose object was lucre rather tha distinction or even power. This process told on the characte of Tammany, making it more and more a machine in th hands of schemers, and thus a dangerous force, even whi its rank and file consisted largely of persons of some mean who were interested as direct taxpayers in the honest a ministration of municipal affairs. After 1850, however, th influx from Europe transformed its membership while addin to its strength. The Irish immigrants were, both as Roma Catholics and in respect of such political sympathies as the brought with them, disposed to enter the Democratic part Tammany laid hold of them, enrolled them as members its district organizations, and rewarded their zeal by admittin a constantly increasing number to posts of importance as di trict leaders, committeemen, and holders of city offices. Whe the Germans arrived, similar efforts were made to captu them, though with a less complete success. Thus from 18 onwards Tammany came more and more to lean upon a find its chief strength in the foreign vote. Of the foreigne who have led it, most have been Irish. Yet it would wrong to represent it, as some of its censors have done, being predominantly Irish in its composition. There ha always been and are now a vast number of native America

nong the rank and file, as well as a few conspicuous among s chiefs. It contains many Germans, probably more than alf of the German voters who can be reckoned as belonging any party. And to-day the large majority of the Russian nd Polish Jews (very numerous in some parts of the city), the Czechs and other Austro-Hungarian Slavs, and posbly also of the Italians, obey its behests, even if not gularly enrolled as members. For the majority of these mmigrants are Democrats, and Tammany has been and is the andard bearer of the Democratic party in the city. It has ad rivals and enemies in that party. Two now extinct val Machines, — Mozart Hall, formerly led by Mr. Fernando Wood, and the "County Democracy," guided for some years the late Mr. Hubert O. Thompson, — at different times onfronted, and sometimes even defeated it; while at other mes "making a deal" with it for a share in municipal oils. Once, as we shall presently see, it incurred the rath of the best Democrats of the city. Still it has on he whole stood for and been at most times practically identied with the Democratic party, posing on the Fourth of July the traditional representative of Jeffersonian principles; nd it has in that capacity grown from the status of a mere ivate club to be an organization commanding more than 30,000 votes, a number usually sufficient to turn the balance the great State of New York, and thereby, perhaps, to termine the result of a Presidential election.

I must, however, return to those early days when Tammany as young and comparatively innocent, days when the Machine ystem and the Spoils system were still but half developed, and hen Chancellor Kent could write (in 1835), that "the office of sistant alderman would be pleasant and desirable to persons leisure, of intelligence, and of disinterested zeal for the wise nd just regulation of the public concerns of the city"! In 834 the mayoralty was placed in the direct gift of the people. 1842 all restrictions on the suffrage in the city were removed, st before the opening of an era when they would have been rviceable. In 1846 the new constitution of the State transrred the election of all judges to the people. In 1857 the ate legislature, which had during the preceding twenty years en frequently modifying the municipal arrangements, enacted

a new charter for the city. The practice of New York State had been, and still is, to pass special laws regulating the frame of government for each of its cities, instead of having one uniform system for all municipalities. It is an unfortunate plan, for it goes far to deprive New York of self-government by putting her at the mercy of the legislature at Albany, which already corrupt, is apt to be still further corrupted by the party leaders of the city, who are able to obtain from it such statutes as they desire. As I am not writing a municipal history of New York, but merely describing the action in that history of a particular party club, no more need be said of the charter and statutes of 1857 than that they greatly limited the powers of the Common Council. The chief administrative functions were vested in the mayor and the heads of various departments, while the power of raising and appropriating revenues was divided between a body called the Board of Supervisors and the legislature. Of the heads of the departments, some were directly chosen by the people, others appointed by the mayor who himself held office for two years. To secure for their adherents some share in the offices of a city with a large Democratic majority, the legislature, then controlled by the Republicans, created a number of new boards for city administration, most of whose members were to be appointed by the Governor of the State. The police of the city in particular, whose condition had been unsatisfactory, were now placed under such a board, wholly independent of the municipal authorities, a change which excited strong local opposition and led to a sanguinary conflict between the old and the new police.

This was the frame of municipal government when the hero who was to make Tammany famous appeared upon the scene. The time was ripe, for the lowest class of voters, foreign and native, had now been thoroughly organized and knew themselves able to control the city. Their power had been shown in the success of a demagogue, the first of the city demagogues named Fernando Wood, who by organizing them had reached the mayoral chair from beginnings so small that he was currently reported to have entered New York as the leg of an artificial elephant in a travelling show. This voting mob were ready to follow Tammany Hall. It had become the

cropolis of the city; and he who could capture it might le as tyrant.[1]

William Marcy Tweed was born in New York in 1823, of a cotch father and an American mother. His earliest occupation as that of a chair-maker — his father's trade; but he failed in usiness, and first became conspicuous by his energy in one of e volunteer fire companies of the city, whereof he was presntly chosen foreman. These companies had a good deal of the ub element in them, and gave their members many opportuties for making friends and becoming known in the district ey served. Tweed had an abounding vitality, free and easy anners, plenty of humour, though of a coarse kind, and a vial, swaggering way which won popularity for him among e lower and rougher sort of people. His size and corpulency ade it all the easier for him to support the part of the genial od fellow; and it must be said to his credit, that though he ade friends lightly, he was always loyal to his friends. either shame nor scruples restrained his audacity. Forty ars earlier these qualities would no more have fitted him be a popular leader than Falstaff's qualities would have ted him to be the chancellor of King Henry the Fifth; and d any one predicted to the upper classes of New York that the isterous fireman of 1845, without industry, eloquence, or edution, would in 1870 be ruler of the greatest city in the western orld, they would have laughed him to scorn. In 1850, however, veed was elected alderman, and soon became noted in the ommon Council, a body already so corrupt (though the tide immigration had only just begun to swell) that they were mmonly described as the Forty Thieves. He came out of it icher man, and was presently sent to Washington as member a district of the city. In the wider arena of Congress, hower, he cut but a poor figure. He seems to have spoken only ce, and then without success. In 1857 he began to repair his rtunes, shattered at the national capital, by obtaining the post Public School Commissioner in New York, and soon afterrds he was elected to the Board of Supervisors, of which was four times chosen president. There his opportunities

[1] The nature and modes of action of Rings in general have been described Part III., Chapters LIX.–LXV. See also as to city government, Chapters L.– . in Part II.

for jobbery and for acquiring influence were much enlarged. "Heretofore his influence and reputation had both been local and outside of his district he had hardly been known at all. Now his sphere of action embraced the whole city, and his large figure began to loom up in portentous magnitude through the foul miasma of municipal politics."[1]

Tweed was by this time a member of Tammany Hall, and in 1863 he was elected permanent Chairman of the General Committee. Not long after he and his friends captured the inner stronghold of the Tammany Society, a more exclusive and hitherto socially higher body; and he became Grand Sachem, with full command both of the Society, with its property and traditional influence, and of the political organization. This triumph was largely due to the efforts of another politician, whose fortunes were henceforward to be closely linked with Tweed's, Mr. Peter B. Sweeny, a lawyer of humble origin but with some cultivation and considerable talents. The two men were singularly unlike, and each fitted to supply the other's defects. Sweeny was crafty and taciturn, unsocial in nature and saturnine in aspect, with nothing to attract the crowd, but skilful in negotiation and sagacious in his political forecasts. He was little seen, preferring to hatch his schemes in seclusion; but his hand was soon felt in the arrangement by which the hostility of Mozart Hall, the rival Democratic organization, was removed, its leader, Fernando Wood, obtaining a seat in Congress, while Tammany was thus left in sole sway of the Democratic vote of the city. The accession of Mozart Hall brought in another recruit to the Tammany group, Mr. A. Oakey Hall. This person was American by origin, better born and educated than his two associates. He was a lawyer by profession, and had occasionally acted as a lobbyist at Albany, working among the Republican members, for he then professed Republican principles, — as Mr. Sweeny had worked occasionally among the Democrats. He had neither the popular arts, such as they were, of Tweed nor the stealthy astuteness of Sweeny, and as he never seemed to take himself seriously, he was not taken seriously by others. But he was quick and adroit, he had acquired some influence among the

[1] Mr. C. F. Wingate in the *North American Review*, No. CCXLV. (1874), p. 368.

Mozart Hall faction; and his position as member of a well-known legal firm seemed to give a faint tinge of respectability to a group which stood sadly in need of that quality. He had been elected District Attorney (public prosecutor) in 1862, by a combination of Mozart Hall with the Republicans (having been previously Assistant District Attorney), and had thus become known to the public. A fourth member was presently added in the person of Richard B. Connolly, who had become influential in the councils of Tammany. This man had been an auctioneer, and had by degrees risen from the secretaryship of a ward committee to be, in 1851, elected County Clerk (although not then yet naturalized as a citizen), and in 1859 State Senator. His friends, who had seen reason to distrust his exactness as a counter of votes, called him Slippery Dick. His smooth manner and insinuating ways inspired little confidence, nor do his talents seem to have gone beyond a considerable skill in figures, a skill which he was soon to put to startling uses. Another man of importance, who was drawn over from the Mozart Hall faction, was Albert Cardozo, a Portuguese Jew, only twenty-six years of age, but with legal talents only less remarkable than the flagrant unscrupulousness with which he prostituted them to party purposes. He was now, through Tammany influence, rewarded for his adhesion by being elected to one of the chief judgeships of the city; and two other equally dishonest minions of the Tweed group were given him as colleagues in the persons of George Barnard and John H. McCunn.

In 1865 Tweed and the other Tammany chiefs, to whom fortune and affinity of aims had linked him, carried for the mayoralty one of their number, Mr. John T. Hoffman, a man of ability, who might have had a distinguished career had he risen under better auspices; and at the election of 1868 they made a desperate effort to capture both the State and the city. Frauds of unprecedented magnitude, both in the naturalizing of foreigners before the election and in the conduct of the election itself, were perpetrated. The average number of persons naturalized by the city courts had been, from 1856 to 1867, 9200. In 1868 this number rose to 41,000, and the process was conducted with unexampled and indecent haste by two of the judges whom Tammany had just placed on the

bench to execute its behests. False registrations, repeating on a large scale, and fraudulent manipulation of the votes given rolled up for Tammany a majority sufficient to secure for its friend Hoffman the governorship of the State. The votes returned as cast in New York City were eight per cent in excess of its total voting population. The vacancy caused by Hoffman's promotion was filled by the election of Mr. Hall. Thus at the beginning of 1869 the group already mentioned found itself in control of the chief offices of the city, and indeed of the State also.[1] Hall was mayor; Sweeny was city chamberlain, that is to say, treasurer of the city and county; Tweed was street commissioner and president of the Board of Supervisors; Connolly, comptroller, and thus in charge of the city finances. Meanwhile their nominee, Hoffman, was State Governor, able to veto any legislation they disliked, while on the city bench they had three apt and supple tools in Cardozo, Barnard, and McCunn. Other less conspicuous men held minor offices, or were leagued with them in managing Tammany Hall, and through it, the city. But the four who have been first named stood out as the four ruling spirits of the faction, to all of whom, more or less, though not necessarily in equal measure, the credit or discredit for its acts attached; and it was to them primarily, though not exclusively, that the name of the Tammany Ring came to be thenceforth applied.[2]

Having a majority in the State legislature, the Ring used it to procure certain changes in the city charter which, while in some respects beneficial, as giving the city more control over its own local affairs, also subserved the purposes of its actual rulers. The elective Board of Supervisors was abolished, and its financial functions transferred to the recorder and aldermen.

[1] "On the 1st of January, 1869," said Mr. Tilden, "when Mr. A. Oakey Hall became mayor, the Ring became completely organized and matured." Pamphlet entitled *The New York City Ring: its Origin, Maturity, and Fall*, New York, 1873.

[2] Elaborate and unsparing portraits of these four gentlemen and of the three Ring judges, as well as of some minor Ringsters, may be found in Mr. Wingate's article in the *North American Review* for October, 1874 (No. CCXLV.). His analysis of their characters and conduct seems to have evoked from them no contradictions, and certainly gave rise to no legal proceedings. Reference may also be made for the history of the Ring generally to the collected speeches of Mr. Samuel J. Tilden (see especially the speech of Nov. 2nd, 1871, in Mr. Bigelow's edition), and to those of Mr. Henry D. Clinton (published as a pamphlet in 1872), as well as to Mr. Tilden's pamphlet already cited.

The executive power was concentrated in the hands of the mayor, who also obtained the power of appointing the chief municipal officers, and that for periods varying from four to eight years. He exercised this power (April, 1870) by appointing Tweed Commissioner of Public Works, Sweeny Commissioner of Parks, and (in pursuance of a subsequent enactment) Connolly Comptroller. In a new board, called the Board of Apportionment, and composed of the Mayor (Hall), the Comptroller (Connolly), the Commissioner of Public Works (Tweed), and the President of the Board of Parks (Sweeny), nearly all authority was now practically vested, for they could levy taxes, appoint the subordinate officials, lay down and enforce ordinances.[1] Besides his power of appointing heads of departments, the mayor had the right to call for reports from them in whatever form he pleased, and also the sole right of impeachment, and he had further, in conjunction with the comptroller, to allow or revise the estimate the board was annually to submit, and to fix the salary of the civil judges. The undisguised supremacy which this new arrangement, amounting almost to dictatorship (purchased, as was believed and may well be believed, by gross bribery, conducted by Tweed himself, in the State legislature at Albany), conferred upon the quatuorvirate was no unmixed advantage, for it concentrated public attention on them, and in promising them impunity it precipitated their fall.

In the reign of the Ring there is little to record beyond the use made by some of them of the opportunities for plunder, which this control of the municipal funds conferred. Plunder of the city treasury, especially in the form of jobbing contracts, was no new thing in New York, but it had never before reached such colossal dimensions. Two or three illustrations may suffice.

Large schemes of street-opening were projected, and for this purpose it became necessary to take and pay compensation for private property, and also, under the State laws, to assess betterment upon owners whose property was to be benefited. Sweeny, who knew something of the fortunes amassed in the rebuilding of Paris under the prefecture of Baron Haussman, and was himself an admirer (and, as was said, an acquaintance) of Louis Napoleon, was credited with knowing how to use public improvements for private profit. Under the auspices

[1] *North American Review* for Jan. 1875 (Vol. CCXLVI., pp. 172–175).

of some members of the Ring, Commissioners for the carrying out of each improvement were appointed by the Ring judges, — in the famous case of the widening of Broadway by Cardozo in a perfectly novel manner. Those members and their friends then began quietly to purchase property in the spots which were eventually taken by the Commissioners, and extravagant compensation was thereupon awarded to them, while other owners, who enjoyed no secret means of predicting the action of the Commissioners, received for similar pieces of land far smaller sums, the burden of betterment also being no less unequally distributed as between the ringsters and other proprietors. In this way great sums passed from the city to those whom the Ring favoured, in certain cases with commissions to some of its members.[1] Among the numerous contracts by which the city treasury was depleted, not a few were afterwards discovered to have been given for printing to three companies in which Tweed and his intimates were interested. Nearly $3,000,000 were paid to them within two years for city printing and stationery. Other contracts for wood-paving and concrete were hardly less scandalous.

The claims outstanding against the Board of Supervisors, previous to 1870, furnished another easy and copious source of revenue, for under a statute which the Ring had procured these claims, largely fraudulent or fictitious, were to be examined and audited by an *ad interim* Board of Audit composed of the Mayor, the Comptroller, and Tweed. The board delegated the duties of auditing to an ex-bankrupt creature of Tweed's named Watson, who had been appointed city auditor, and who went to work with such despatch that in three and a half months he had presented warrants for claims to the amount of $6,312,000 to the members of the *ad interim* board — for the board itself seems to have met only once — on whose signature these bills were accordingly paid out of the city treasury.[2] Subsequent investigation showed that from 65 to 85 per cent of the bills thus passed were fictitious, and of the whole Tweed appears to have received 24 per cent. But all the other financial achievements of the Ring pale their ineffectua

[1] Details may be read in *North American Review*, Vol. CCXLVI., pp 131–135.

[2] *North American Review*, July, 1875 (No. CCXLVIII., pp. 116–120).

fires beside those connected with the erection and furnishing of the County Court House. When designed in 1868 its cost was estimated at $250,000. Before the end of 1871 a sum variously estimated at from $8,000,000 to $13,000,000 (£1,600,000 to £2,600,000) had been expended upon it, and it was still unfinished. This was effected, as was afterwards proved in judicial proceedings, by the simple method of requiring the contractors, many of whom resisted for a time, to add large sums to their bills, sums which were then appropriated by Tweed, Connolly, and their minions or accomplices.[1] Nothing could have been more direct or more effective. The orders were given by Tweed, the difference between the real and the nominal charge was settled by the contractor with him or with the auditor, and the bills, passed and signed by the members of the Board of Supervisors or Board of Apportionment (as the case might be), were approved by the auditor Watson and were paid out of the city funds at the bank. The proceeds were then duly divided, his real charges, or perhaps a little more, going to the contractor, and the rest among the Boss and his friends.

Under such a system there was nothing surprising in the growth of the city debt. Fresh borrowing powers as well as taxing powers had been obtained from the State legislature, and they were freely used. According to the published report of the committee which subsequently investigated the city finances, the bonded debt of the city rose from $36,293,000 at the beginning of 1869, to $97,287,000 in September, 1871; that is, by $61,000,000. Adding to this the floating debt incurred during the same two years and eight months, viz. $20,000,000, the total price which the city paid for the privilege of being ruled by Tammany during those thirty-two months reached $81,000,000 (£16,200,000), or more than twice the amount of the debt as it stood in 1868.[2] And for

[1] Among the items in the bills for fitting up and furnishing the Court House (amounting to more than $6,000,000, besides more than $2,000,000 for repairs), the items of $404,347 for safes, and $7500 for thermometers were found amusing when eventually disclosed.

[2] I take these figures from the report of Mr. Andrew H. Green (then comptroller of the city) made in October, 1874. Of the unliquidated debt claims, many of which were then still outstanding, the report says: "Only a small proportion of this monstrous legacy of corruption and misgovernment was

all this there was hardly anything in the way of public improvements to show.

What, it may be asked, did the people of New York, and in particular the taxpayers at whose expense these antics were proceeding, think of their rulers, and how did they come to acquiesce in such a government, which, not content with plundering them, had degraded justice itself in the person of the Ring judges, and placed the commerce and property of the city at the mercy of unscrupulous and venal partisans? I was in New York in the summer of 1870, and saw the Ring flourishing like a green bay-tree. Though the frauds just described were of course still unknown, nobody had a word of respect for its members. Tweed, for instance, would never have been invited to any respectable house. I was taken to look at justices Barnard and Cardozo as two of the most remarkable sights of the city; and such indeed they were. I inquired why such things were endured, not merely patiently, but even with a sort of amused enjoyment, as though the citizens were proud of having produced a new phenomenon the like whereof no other community could show. It was explained to me that these things had not come suddenly, but as the crown of a process of degradation prolonged for some fifteen years or more which had made corruption so familiar as to be no longer shocking. The respectable leaders of the Democratic party had, with few exceptions, winked at the misdeeds of those who commanded a vote which they needed for State and national purposes. The press had been largely muzzled by lavish payments made to it for advertising, and a good many minor journals were actually subsidized by the Ring. The Bench, though only partially corrupt, was sufficiently in league with the Ring for the sanction which the law required from it in certain cases to be unavailable as a safeguard. As for the mass of citizens, on whose votes this structure of iniquity had been reared, nearly half of them were practically strangers to America, amenable to their own clubs and leaders

free from evidence of the most ingeniously and diabolically contrived fraud. For three years the million-headed hydra has been struggling to force the doors of the treasury. It has bought, bribed, and brought to its aid by the offer of a division of profits in case of success, the fraud, the craft, and the greed of the most unscrupulous lawyers, legislators, and plotters in the community. It has tainted the press and dictated political nominations." (p. 7

but with no sense of civic duty to their new country nor likely to respond to any appeals from its statesmen. Three-fourths or more of them paid little or nothing in the way of direct taxes and did not realize that the increase of civic burdens would ultimately fall upon them as well as upon the rich. Moreover, the Ring had cunningly placed on the pay rolls of the city a large number of persons rendering comparatively little service, who had become a body of janizaries, bound to defend the government which paid them, working hard for it at elections, and adding, together with the regular employés, no contemptible quota to the total Tammany vote.[1] As for the Boss, those very qualities in him which repelled men of refinement made him popular with the crowd.

I asked what under such circumstances the respectable citizens proposed to do. My friends raised their eyebrows. One, of a historical turn, referred to the experience of Rome in the days of Clodius and Milo, and suggested the hiring of gladiators.

"These be thy gods, O Democracy: these are the fruits of abstract theory in politics. It was for this then that the yoke of George the Third was broken and America hailed as the dayspring of freedom by the peoples of Europe — that a robber should hold the keys of the public treasury, and a ruffian be set to pollute the seat of justice." So might the shade of Alexander Hamilton have spoken, if permitted to revisit, after seventy years, the city his genius had adorned. Yet it was not such a democracy as Jefferson had sought to create and Hamilton to check that had delivered over to Tweed and to Barnard the greatest city of the Western World. That was the work of corruptions unknown to the days of Jefferson and Hamilton, of the Spoils system, of election frauds, of the gift of the suffrage to a host of ignorant strangers, and above all of the apathy of those wealthy and educated classes, without whose participation the best-framed government must speedily degenerate.

In the autumn of 1870 the Ring seemed securely seated. Tweed, the master spirit, was content to scoop in money, and

[1] Mr. Tilden (*Origin and Fall of the New York Ring*) observes that the Ring had at its disposal "the whole local government machinery, with its expenditure and patronage and its employment of at least 12,000 persons, besides its possession of the police, its influence on the judiciary, its control of the inspectors and canvassers of the elections."

enjoy the licentious luxury which it procured him; though some declared that he had fixed his eyes upon the American legation in London. Sweeny preferred the substance to the ostentation of power; and Connolly's tastes were as vulgar as Tweed's, without the touch of open-handedness which seemed to palliate the latter's greed. Cardozo, however, had his ambitions, and hungered for a place on the Supreme Federal Bench; while Hall, to whom no share in the booty was ever traced, and who may not have received any, was believed to desire to succeed Hoffman as Governor of the State, when that official should be raised by the growing influence of Tammany to the Presidency of the United States. No wonder the Ring was intoxicated by the success it had already won. It had achieved a fresh triumph in re-electing Hall as Mayor at the end of 1870; and New York seemed to lie at its feet.

Its fall came suddenly; and the occasion sprang from a petty personal quarrel. A certain O'Brien, conspicuous as a leader in a discontented section of the Democratic party, was also personally sore because he had received an office below his hopes, and cherished resentment against Sweeny, to whom he attributed his disappointment. A henchman of his named Copeland, employed in the auditor's office, happened to find there some accounts headed "County Liabilities" which struck him as suspicious. He copied them, and showed them to O'Brien, who perceived their value, and made him copy more of them, in fact a large part of the fraudulent accounts relating to the furnishing of the Court House. Threatening the Ring with the publication of these compromising documents, O'Brien tried to extort payment of an old claim he had against the city: but after some haggling the negotiations were interrupted by the accidental death of Watson, the Auditor. Ultimately O'Brien carried his copies to the New York *Times*, a paper which had already for some months past been attacking Tammany with unwonted boldness. On the 8th of July, 1871, it exposed the operations of the Ring; and denounced its members, in large capitals, as thieves and swindlers, defying them to sue it for libel. Subsequent issues contained extracts from the accounts copied by Copeland; and all were summed up in a supplement, published on July 29th and printed in German as well as English, which showed that

a sum of nearly $10,000,000 in all had been expended upon the Court House, whose condition everybody could see, and for armoury repairs and furnishings. Much credit is due to the proprietor of the *Times*, who resisted threats and bribes offered him on behalf of the Ring to desist from his onslaught, and perhaps even more to the then editor, the late Mr. Louis J. Jennings, whose conduct of the campaign was full of fire and courage. The better classes of the city were now fully aroused, for the denials or defences of the mayor and Tweed found little credence. On September 4th a meeting of citizens was held, and a committee of seventy persons, many of them eminent by ability, experience, or position, formed to investigate the frauds charged, which by this time had drawn the eyes of the whole State and country. It is needless to recount the steps by which Connolly, the person most directly implicated, and the one whom his colleagues ought to make a scapegoat of, was forced to appoint as deputy an active and upright man (Mr. A. H. Green), whose possession and examination of the records in the comptroller's office proved invaluable. The leading part in the campaign was played by Mr. Samuel J. Tilden, chairman of the Democratic party in the State, afterwards Governor of the State, and in 1876 candidate for the Federal Presidency against Mr. Hayes. Feeling acutely the disgrace which the Ring had brought upon the Democratic party, he was resolved by pursuit and exposure to rid the party of them and their coterie once for all; and in this he was now seconded by all the better Democrats. But much was also due to the brilliant cartoons of Mr. Thomas Nast, whose rich invention and striking drawing presented the four leading members of the Ring in every attitude and with every circumstance of ignominy.[1] The election for State offices held in November was attended by unusual excitement. The remaining members of the Ring, for Connolly was now extinct and some of the minor figures had taken to flight, faced it boldly, and Tweed in particular, cheered by his renomination in the Democratic State Convention held

[1] Tweed felt the sharpness of the weapon. He said once: "I don't care a straw for your newspaper articles: my constituents don't know how to read, but they can't help seeing them damned pictures"; and indeed there was always a crowd round the windows in which *Harper's Weekly* (then admirably edited by the late Mr. George William Curtis) was displayed.

shortly beforehand, and by his re-election to the chairmanship of the General Committee of Tammany, now neither explained nor denied anything, but asked defiantly in words which in New York have passed into a proverb, "What are you going to do about it?" His reliance on his own district of the city, and on the Tammany masses as a whole, was justified, for he was re-elected to the State Senate and the organization gave his creatures its solid support. But the respectable citizens, who had for once been roused from their lethargy, and who added their votes to those of the better sort of Democrats and of the Republican party, overwhelmed the machine, notwithstanding the usual election frauds undertaken on its behalf. Few of the Ring candidates survived, and the Ring itself was irretrievably ruined. Public confidence returned, and the price of real estate advanced. Sweeny forthwith announced his withdrawal from public life, and retired to Canada. The wretched Connolly was indicted, and found so few friends that he remained in jail for six weeks before he could procure bail. Tweed, though dispirited by the murder of his boon-companion, the notorious Fisk (who had been carrying through the scandalous Erie frauds by the help of the Ring judges), stood his ground with characteristic courage, and refused to resign the office to which the mayor had appointed him. However, in December he was arrested,[1] but presently released on insignificant bail by Judge Barnard. The State Assembly, in which the reformers had now a majority, soon afterwards took steps to impeach Barnard, McCunn, and Cardozo. Cardozo resigned; the other two were convicted and removed from the bench. The endless delays and minute technicalities of the courts of New York protracted Tweed's trial till January, 1873, when after a long hearing, the jury were discharged because unable to agree. He was thereupon rearrested, and upon his second trial in November, when special efforts had been made to secure a trustworthy jury, was found guilty and sentenced to twelve years' imprisonment. After a while the Court of Appeals released him, holding the sentence irregular, because cumulative; he was then rearrested in a civil suit by the city, escaped, was caught in Spain, identified by a caricature, an

[1] When asked on being committed to state his occupation and creed, he answered that he was a statesman, and of no religion.

brought back to prison, where he died in 1876. Hall was thrice tried. On the first occasion the death of a juryman interrupted the proceedings; on the second the jury disagreed; on the third he obtained a favourable verdict. Connolly fled the country and died in exile. None of the group, nor of Tweed's other satellites, ever again held office.

This was the end of the Tweed Ring. But it was not the end of Tammany. Abashed for the moment, and stooping earthward while the tempest swept by, that redoubtable organization never relaxed its grip upon the New York masses. It was only for a few months that the tempest cleared the air. The "good citizens" soon forgot their sudden zeal. Neglecting the primaries, where indeed they might have failed to effect much, they allowed nominations to fall back into the hands of spoilsmen, and the most important city offices to be fought for by factions differing only in their names and party badges, because all were equally bent upon selfish gain. Within five years from the overthrow of 1871, Tammany was again in the saddle, and the city government practically in the nomination of Mr. John Kelly, tempered by the rival influence of the ex-prize fighter Morrissey. In 1876 a vigorous pen, reviewing the history of the preceding eight years, and pointing out how soon the old mischiefs had reappeared, thus described the position: —

"A few very unscrupulous men, realizing thoroughly the changed condition of affairs, had organized the proletariat of the city; and, through the form of suffrage, had taken possession of its government. They saw clearly the facts of the case, which the doctrinaires, theorists, and patriots studiously ignored or vehemently denied. They knew perfectly well that New York City was no longer a country town, inhabited by Americans and church-goers, and officered by deacons. They recognized the existence of a very large class which had nothing, and availed themselves of its assistance to plunder those who had something. The only way to meet them effectually and prevent a recurrence of the experience is for the friends of good government equally to recognize facts and shape their course accordingly. The question then is a practical one.

"If New York, or any other great city in America which finds itself brought face to face with this issue, were an independent autonomy, — like Rome or many of the free cities of the Middle Ages, — the question would at once be divested of all that which in America makes it difficult of solution. Under these circumstances the evil would run its course, and cure itself in the regular and natural way. New York would have a Cæsar

within six months. Whether he came into power at the head of the proletariat or seized the government as the conservator of property would make no difference. The city would instinctively find rest under a strong rule. The connection which exists, and necessarily can never be severed, between the modern great city and the larger State, closes this natural avenue of escape. New York City is tied to New York State, and must stumble along as best it may at its heels. It is guaranteed a government republican in form, and consequently a radical remedy for the evil must be found within that form, or it cannot be found at all, and the evil must remain uncured.

"The thing sought for then is to obtain a municipal government, republican in form, in which property, as well as persons, shall be secured in its rights, at the cost of a reasonable degree only of public service on the part of the individual citizen. The facts to be dealt with are few and patent. On the one side a miscellaneous population, made up largely of foreigners, and containing an almost preponderating element of vice, ignorance, and poverty, all manipulated by a set of unscrupulous professional politicians; on the other a business community, engrossed in affairs, amassing wealth rapidly, and caring little for politics. Between the two the usual civic population, good and bad, intent on pleasure, art, literature, science, and all the myriad other pursuits of metropolitan life. The two essential points are the magnitude and the diversified pursuits of the population, and its division into those who have and those who have not.

"Bearing these facts, which cannot be changed, in mind, then a few cardinal principles on which any successful municipal government, republican in form, must rest, may safely be formulated. In the first place, the executive must be strong and responsible; in the second place, property must be entitled to a representation as well as persons; in the third place, the judiciary must be as far removed as possible from the political arena. In other words, justice must be made as much as possible to descend from above. Curiously enough, each of these principles, instead of being a novelty, is but a recurrence to the ancient ways."[1]

These counsels, and many others like them, have not been taken to heart. Since 1871 there have been many tinkerings with the frame of municipal government. A comprehensive scheme of reform, proposed by a strong commission which Governor Tilden appointed in 1876, failed to be carried; and though something has been done in the way of better ballot and election laws, and of civil service reform, the Spoils system still thrives and election returns can still be manipulated by those who control the city government. There have been some excellent mayors, such as Mr. Hewitt, for the catastroph

[1] *North American Review* for October, 1876 (No. CCLIII., p. 421), an unsigned article.

of 1871 has never been forgotten by Tammany, whose chief-ains sometimes find it prudent to run reputable candidates. No more Barnards or Cardozos have disgraced the bench, for he Bar Association is vigorous and watchful; and when very recently a judge who had been too subservient to a suspected State Boss, was nominated by the influence of that gentleman o one of the highest judicial posts in the State, the efforts of he Association, well supported in the city, procured his defeat by an overwhelming majority.

Nevertheless, Tammany is still supreme; and the august lynasty of bosses goes on. When Mr. John Kelly died some years ago, the sceptre passed to the hands of the not less capa-ble and resolute Mr. Richard Croker, once the keeper of a iquor saloon, and for some short time the holder of a clerk-hip under Tweed himself.[1] Mr. Croker, like Lorenzo de' Medici in Florence, holds no civic office, but, as Chairman of he Tammany sub-committee on organization, controls all city fficials, while, by the public avowal of the Speaker of the House of Assembly, during the session of 1893, "all legislation (*i.e.* in the State legislature at Albany) emanated from Tam-nany Hall, and was dictated by that great statesman, Richard Croker."[2]

The reader will expect some further words to explain how he Tammany of to-day is organized, by what means it holds ts power, and what sort of government it gives the city.

Each of the thirty "assembly districts" in the city annually lects a certain number of members, varying from 60 to 270, to it on the General Committee of Tammany Hall, which has long laimed to be, and at present is, the "regular" Democratic rganization of the city. The Committee is thus large, num-bering several thousand persons, and on it there also sit the great chiefs who are above taking district work. Each dis-rict has also a "Leader" (not elected but appointed by the

[1] Full details regarding the career of Mr. Croker, of his henchman, Police ustice Patrick Divver, and of other Tammany "braves" of to-day, may be ound in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly* for February, 1894, by Mr. H. C. Merwin, and more fully in the "Annual Records" of Assemblymen and Sen-tors from New York City, published by the City Reform Club.

[2] Mr. D. G. Thompson, *Politics in a Democracy*, p. 127, an odd little book which purports to defend Tammany by showing that it gives the New York lasses the sort of government they desire and deserve.

General Committee), who is always on the General Committee; and the thirty leaders form the Executive Committee of the Hall, which has also other committees, including that on finance, whereof Mr. Croker is chairman. Each election district has, moreover, a District Committee, with the "leader" as chairman and practically as director. This Committee appoints a Captain for every one of the voting precincts into which the district is divided. There are about 1100 such precincts, and these 1100 captains are held responsible for the vote cast in their respective precincts. The captain is probably a liquor-seller, and as such has opportunities of getting to know the lower class of voters. He has often some small office, and usually some little patronage, as well as some money, to bestow. In each of the thirty districts there is a party headquarters for the Committee and the local party work, and usually, also, a clubhouse, where party loyalty is cemented over cards and whiskey, besides a certain number of local "associations," called after prominent local politicians, who are expected to give an annual picnic, or other kind of treat, to their retainers. A good deal of social life, including dances and summer outings, goes on in connection with these clubs.[1]

Such an organization as this, with its tentacles touching every point in a vast and amorphous city, is evidently a most potent force, especially as this force is concentrated in one hand — that of the Boss of the Hall. He is practically autocratic; and under him these thousands of officers, controlling from 120,000 to 150,000 votes, move with the precision of a machine.[2] However, it is not only in this mechanism, which may be called a legitimate method of reaching the voters, that the strength of Tammany lies. Its control of the city government gives it endless opportunities of helping its friends, of worrying its opponents, and of enslaving the liquor-dealers. Their licences are at its mercy, for the police can proceed against or wink at breaches of the law, according to the amount of loyalty the saloon-keeper shows to the Hall. From

[1] Full and clear descriptions may be found in Mr. H. C. Merwin's article already cited, and in Mr. Thompson's book, pp. 66 *sqq*.

[2] The highest total vote ever cast in New York was 285,000 (in 1892). In the city election of 1890 Tammany polled 116,000 votes out of 216,000 cast; in 1892 the Tammany candidate for mayor had 173,000, there being, however, no other Democratic candidate.

ne contributions of the liquor interest a considerable revenue raised; more is obtained by assessing office-holders, down to ne very small ones; and, perhaps, most of all by blackmailing ealthy men and corporations, who find that the city authorities have so many opportunities of interfering vexatiously ith their business that they prefer to buy them off and live peace.[1] The worst form of this extortion is the actual mplicity with criminals which consists in sharing the profits crime. A fruitful source of revenue, roughly estimated at 1,000,000 a year, is derived, when the party is supreme at lbany, from legislative blackmailing in the legislature, or, ther, from undertaking to protect the great corporations from ne numerous "strikers," who threaten them there with bills. case has been mentioned in which as much as $60,000 was deanded from a great company; and the president of another reported to have said (1893): "Formerly we had to keep a an at Albany to buy off the 'strikers' one by one. This year e simply paid over a lump sum to the Ring, and they looked fter our interests." But of all their engines of power none so elastic as their command of the administration of criminal stice. The mayor appoints the police justices, usually selectg them from certain Tammany workers, sometimes from the iminal class, not often from the legal profession. These stices are often Tammany leaders in their respective disicts.[2] Says a distinguished publicist: —

"The police captain of the precinct, the justice of the police court, and e district leader of the Tammany organization are all leagued together keep the poor in subjection and prevent the rich from interfering. eir means of annoyance for a poor man are endless. They can arrest m on small pretences, prevent his getting employment from the city, or y contractors, pursue him for allowing his goods to remain on the sidelk, and for not cleaning off the snow promptly, tax him heavily, or let m go free. All these means of persecution are freely resorted to, so at the poor, and especially the foreign poor, are really as much in subtion to Tammany as the Italians to the Camorra. The source of it all the character of the mayor. He appoints the police commissioners, and e commissioners appoint the captains, and he appoints the police jus-

[1] The recent Investigating Committee of the New York State Senate has st a scorching light on this so-called "Police Protective Tariff," as to ich see also an article in the *Forum* for August, 1894, by Mr. J. B. Leavitt.
[2] *Atlantic Monthly, ut supra.*

tices also, and is responsible for their quality. When the act under whic the present justices act was under consideration in the legislature, th proviso that all appointees should be lawyers of a certain standing at th bar was stricken out, so that the mayor has a completely free hand i selection, and the result is that most of those appointed recently unde the Tammany régime are old 'toughs,' liquor-dealers, gamblers, or sim ple adventurers, who have lived from the age of twenty by holding sma offices, such as doorkeepers or clerks of the minor city courts.

"Now there is in the moral sphere of city government nothing s important as what I may call the administration of petty justice, that i justice among the poor, ignorant, and friendless, the class who cannot pa lawyers or find bail, and especially that very large class in the cities o our eastern coast, of poor foreigners who know nothing of our laws an constitutions, and to whom the police magistrate or the police captai represent the whole government of the country, Federal, State, and mun cipal, who accept without a murmur any sentence which may be pro nounced on them, or any denial of justice which may overtake them They get all their notions of the national morality, and really their earl est political training, from their contact with these officers and with th district "leader." Upon their experience with these people it depend very much what kind of citizens they will become, they and their childre after them. Well, one of the very first lessons they learn is that the can have no standing in court unless they are members of the Tamman Society, or as simple voters, they have a 'pull,' that is, some sort occult influence with the magistrate. In default of this their complain are dismissed, and they are found guilty and sent up to 'the Island,' held in bail which they cannot procure, or in some manner worsted."[1]

With such sources of power it is not surprising that Tam many Hall commands the majority of the lower and the foreig masses of New York, though it has never been shown to hol an absolute majority of all the voters of the city. Its loc strength is exactly proportioned to the character of the loc population; and though there are plenty of native American among the rank and file as well as among the leaders, still is from the poorer districts, inhabited by Jews, Irish, German Italians, Bohemians, that its heaviest vote comes.[2] These po people do not support it because it is vicious. They like and think it a good thing; it satisfies their instincts of comb nation and good fellowship; it is often all the government the know. Mr. Merwin puts the attitude of the better sort

[1] Mr. E. L. Godkin in *Annals of the Amer. Acad. of Polit. Science* for Ma 1894, p. 17.

[2] An instructive examination of the vote by districts which brings this res clearly out is given by Mr. Thompson, pp. 79–91.

ammany adherents, and particularly of the native Americans, hen he writes, —

"The Tammany man dislikes and despises the Anglomania of what is lled 'society' in New York; he distrusts the people who compose 'so-ety' and believes them at heart out of sympathy with American princi-es, whereas Tammany in his view is a concrete protest against monarchy nd monarchical arrangements of society. He considers that Tammany , on the whole, a good body, that it gives New York a good government, nat it stands for what is manly and patriotic. It troubles him somewhat nat a few of the leaders are said to be acquiring ill-gotten gains; and if ne scandal increases he will overthrow those leaders and appoint others their stead. Meanwhile Tammany is his party, his church, his club, s totem. To be loyal to something is almost a necessity of all incorrupt atures, and especially of the Celtic nature. The Tammany man is loyal Tammany.

"In truth, there is very little in New York to suggest any higher ideal. Vhat kind of a spectacle does the city present to a man working his way o from poverty to wealth, — to one, for instance, who began as a 'tough,' nd ends as a capitalist? The upper class — at least the richer class, the ass chiefly talked about in the papers — is, with exceptions, of course, ven over to material luxury and to ostentation. It is without high aims, ithout sympathy, without civic pride or feeling. It has not even the ersonal dignity of a real aristocracy. Its sense of honour is very crude. nd as this class is devoted to the selfish spending, so the business class devoted to the remorseless getting, of money." [1]

To this description of the attitude of the Tammany rank and le it may be added that, as few of them pay any direct taxes, ney have no sense of the importance of economy in admin-tration. True it is that they ultimately pay, through their nt and otherwise, for whatever burdens are laid on the city. ut they do not perceive this, — and as the lawyers say, *De on apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio.* The gov-nment of the rich by the poor is a new phenomenon in the orld; and where the rich have little contact with the poor nd the poor little respect for the rich, happy results can hardly e expected. Apart from the abuse of the minor criminal jus-ce, apart from the blackmailing of innocent men as well as offenders, apart from the impunity which the payment of ackmail secures to some forms of vice,[2] apart from such

[1] *Atlantic Monthly, ut supra.*

[2] Very great credit is due to a courageous clergyman who lately at some per-nal risk succeeded in exposing this system, and helped thereby to obtain the pointment of the recent Investigating Committee.

lapses from virtue as that of the aldermen who sold the right of laying a railroad in Broadway, — twenty-two out of the twenty-four were indicted for bribery, — the actual administration of the city injures and offends the ordinary citizen less than might have been expected. The police force, often as they are made the engine of extortion or the accomplice in vice, are an efficient force, though too harsh in their methods, and they keep life and property secure.[1] The fire department is well managed; the water supply is copious; the public schools are now usually, though not invariably, kept "out of politics." If the government is not economical, it is not palpably extravagant; and the rulers who grow rich through it do so by indirect methods, and not out of the city treasury. Scandals like those of Tweed's time are unknown. The city debt has been reduced since 1876 to $104,000,000, though it must be added that the swift increase of the wealth of the city has enabled a rate of taxation moderate for the United States ($1.85 to $1.79 on the valuation of property) to produce an immense revenue.[2] Considering what by origin, by training, by environment, and by tastes and habits, are the persons who rule the city through Tammany — considering the criminal element among them and their close association with the liquor saloons, it may excite surprise that the government, corrupt as it is, is not also more wasteful.[3]

Those who have grasped the singular condition of New York and its population, will find it less surprising that this government should have proved itself so hard to overthrow. In 1890 a great effort to overthrow it was made. A section of the Democrats leagued itself with the Republicans to bring out what was understood to be "a joint ticket," while the Inde-

[1] The Senate Committee has elicited the fact — already indeed suspected — that an applicant for employment in the police must pay for appointment, and an officer must contribute a large sum either to the Ring or to the Police Commissioners for promotion.

[2] "The increase in the assessed valuation of property (real and personal) in New York City is annually about $70,000,000; and in 1893 reached the unprecedented sum of $105,254,253." — *City Government in the U. S.*, by Mr Alfred R. Conkling, New York, 1894.

[3] "The city is governed to-day by three or four men of foreign birth who are very illiterate, are sprung from the dregs of the foreign population, have never pursued any regular calling, were entirely unknown to the bulk of the residents only five years ago, and now set the criticisms of the intelligent and educated classes at defiance." — *Annals of the Amer. Acad., ut supra.*

pendent Reformers blessed the alliance, and endorsed its candidates.[1] Success had been hoped for; but Tammany routed its adversaries by 23,000 votes. It turned out that about 30,000 Republicans had not voted, — some because their bosses, secretly friendly to Tammany, did not canvass them, some because they did not care to vote for anything but a Republican ticket, some out of sheer indifference and laziness. Strongly entrenched as Tammany is, Tammany could be overthrown if the "good citizens" were to combine for municipal reform, setting aside for local purposes those distinctions of national party which have nothing to do with city issues. The rulers of the Wigwam, as Tammany is affectionately called, do not care for national politics, except as a market in which the Tammany vote may be sold. That the good citizens of New York should continue to rivet on their necks the yoke of a club which is almost as much a business concern as one of their own dry-goods stores, by dividing forces which, if united, would break the tyranny of the last forty years, — this indeed seems strange, yet perhaps no stranger than other instances of the power of habit, of laziness, of names and party spirit. In such a policy of union, and in the stimulation of a keener sense of public duty rather than in further changes of the mechanism of government, lies the best hope of reform. After the many failures of the past, it is not safe to be sanguine. But there does appear to be at this moment a more energetic spirit at work among reformers than has ever been seen before, and a stronger sense that the one supreme remedy is to strike at the root of the evil by arousing the conscience of the better classes, both rich and poor, and by holding up to them a higher ideal of civic life.[2]

[1] Being in New York during the election, I spent some hours in watching the voting in the densely peopled tenement-house districts and thus came to realize better than figures can convey how largely New York is a European city, but a European city of no particular country, with elements of ignorance and squalor from all of them.

[2] Since the above was put in type (Sept., 1894) Tammany has been smitten with a great slaughter in the election of Nov., 1894. This result, even more striking than the overthrow of the Tweed Ring in Nov., 1871, seems to have been chiefly due to the anger roused by the exposures of police maladministration already adverted to. Such a victory, however, is only a first step in the purification of municipal politics, and will need to be followed up more actively and persistently than was the victory of 1871. If the rowers who have so gallantly breasted the current drop even for a moment their stalwart arms, they will again be swept swiftly downwards.

CHAPTER LXXXIX

THE PHILADELPHIA GAS RING

PHILADELPHIA, though it has not maintained that primacy among American cities which in the days of the Revolution was secured to it by its population and its central position, is still one of the greatest cities in America, with a population of more than a million.[1] Though the element of recent immigrants is much smaller than in New York or Boston or Chicago[2] the old Quaker character has died out, or remains perceptible only in a certain air of staid respectability which marks the city as compared with the luxury of New York and the tumultuous rush of Chicago. It has of late years been strongly Republican in its politics, partly because that party obtained complete ascendency during the war, partly because Pennsylvania is a Protectionist State, owing to her manufacturing industries, and Philadelphia, as the stronghold of protection, is attached to the party which upholds those doctrines. During the Civil War the best citizens were busily absorbed in its great issues, and both then and for some time after, welcomed all the help that could be given to their party by any men who knew how to organize the voters and bring them up to the polls; while at the same time their keen interest in national questions made them inattentive to municipal affairs. Accordingly, the local control and management of the party fell into the hands of obscure citizens, men who had their own ends to serve, their own fortunes to make, but who were valuable to the party because they kept it in power through their assiduous work among a lower class of voters. These local leaders formed combinations with party managers in the State legislature which sits at Harrisburg, the capital of Pennsylvania, and with a clique managed from Washington by a well-known sen-

[1] In 1890 it was 1,046,964.

[2] Only fifteen per cent of the people of Philadelphia are of foreign birth, whereas in Boston the percentage is thirty-five and in Chicago nearly forty-two

atorial family, which for a long time controlled the Pennsylvania vote in Republican national conventions and in Congress. They were therefore strongly entrenched, having powerful allies, both in State politics and in Federal politics. Since they commanded the city vote, both these sets of politicians were obliged to conciliate them; while the commercial interests of Philadelphia in the maintenance of a protective tariff have for many years pressed so strongly on the minds of her merchants and manufacturers as to make them unwilling to weaken the Republican party in either State or city by any quarrel with those who swayed its heavy vote.

The obscure citizens of whom I have spoken had begun by acquiring influence in the primaries, and then laid their hands on the minor, ultimately also on the more important, city offices. They sometimes placed men of good social standing in the higher posts, but filled the inferior ones, which were very numerous, with their own creatures. The water department, the highway department, the tax department, the city treasurer's department, the county commissioner's office, fell into their hands. A mayor appointed by them filled the police with their henchmen till it became a completely partisan force. But the centre of their power was the Gas Trust, administered by trustees, one of whom, by his superior activity and intelligence, secured the command of the whole party machinery, and reached the high position of recognized Boss of Philadelphia. This gentleman, Mr. James M'Manes, having gained influence among the humbler voters, was appointed one of the Gas Trustees, and soon managed to bring the whole of that department under his control. It employed (I was told) about two thousand persons, received large sums, and gave out large contracts. Appointing his friends and dependants to the chief places under the Trust, and requiring them to fill the ranks of its ordinary workmen with persons on whom they could rely, the Boss acquired the control of a considerable number of votes and of a large annual revenue. He and his confederates then purchased a controlling interest in the principal horse-car (street tramway) company of the city, whereby they became masters of a large number of additional voters. All these voters were of course expected to act as "workers," i.e. they occupied themselves with the party organization of

the city, they knew the meanest streets and those who dwelt therein, they attended and swayed the primaries, and when an election came round, they canvassed and brought up the voters. Their power, therefore, went far beyond their mere voting strength, for a hundred energetic "workers" mean at least a thousand votes. With so much strength behind them, the Gas Ring, and Mr. M'Manes at its head, became not merely indispensable to the Republican party in the city, but in fact its chiefs, able therefore to dispose of the votes of all those who were employed permanently or temporarily in the other departments of the city government — a number which one hears estimated as high as twenty thousand.[1] Nearly all the municipal offices were held by their nominees. They commanded a majority in the Select council and Common council. They managed the nomination of members of the State legislature. Even the Federal officials in the custom-house and post-office were forced into a dependent alliance with them, because their support was so valuable to the leaders in Federal politics that it had to be purchased by giving them their way in city affairs. There was no getting at the Trust, because "its meetings were held in secret, its published annual report to the city council was confused and unintelligible, and (as was subsequently proved) actually falsified."[2] Mr. M'Manes held the pay roll under lock and key, so that no one could know how many employés there were, and it was open to him to increase their

[1] The ballot did not protect these voters. Prior to the introduction of the so-called 'Australian' ballot in 1891 it was generally possible for the presiding election officer to know how each man voted.

[2] See *Report of the Committee of One Hundred*, published November, 1884. A leading citizen of Philadelphia, from whom I have sought an explanation of the way in which the Gas Trust had managed to entrench itself, writes me as follows: — "When in 1835 gas was first introduced in Philadelphia, it was manufactured by a private company, but the city reserved the right to buy out the stockholders. When this was done, in 1841, with the object of keeping the works 'out of politics,' the control was vested in a board of twelve, each serving for three years. These were constituted trustees of the loans issued for the construction and enlargement of the works. Their appointment was lodged in the hands of the city councils; but when, on more than one occasion the councils endeavoured to obtain control of the works, the courts were appealed to and decided that the board, as trustees for the bondholders, could not be interfered with until the last of the bonds issued under this arrangement had matured and had been paid off. Thirty-year loans under these conditions were issued until 1855, so that it was not until 1885 that the city was able to break within the charmed circle of the Trust."

umber to any extent. The city councils might indeed ask for nformation, but he was careful to fill the city councils with is nominees, and to keep them in good humour by a share of whatever spoil there might be, and still more by a share of patronage.

That so vast and solid an edifice of power, covering the whole of a great city, should be based on the control of a single department like the Gas Trust may excite surprise. But it must be remembered that when a number of small factions combine to rule a party, that faction which is a little larger, or better organized, or better provided with funds, than the others, obtains the first place among them, and may keep it so long as it gives to the rest a fair share of the booty, and directs the policy of the confederates with firmness and skill. Personal capacity, courage, resolution, foresight, the judicious preference of the substance of power to its display, are qualities whose union in one brain is so uncommon in any group of men that their possessor acquires an ascendency which lasts until he provokes a revolt by oppression, or is seen to be leading his party astray. And by the admission even of his enemies, Mr. M'Manes possessed these qualities. His origin was humble, his education scanty, but he atoned for these deficiencies by tact and knowledge of the world, with a quietly decorous demeanour veiling an imperious will. He knew how to rule without challenging opposition by the obtrusion of his own personality, nor does he seem to have used his power to plunder the city for his own behoof. The merit of the system was that it perpetuated itself, and in fact grew stronger the longer it stood. Whenever an election was in prospect the ward primaries of the Republican party were thronged by the officers and workpeople of the Gas Trust and other city departments, who secured the choice of such delegates as the Ring had previously selected in secret conclave. Sometimes, especially in the wards inhabited by the better sort of citizens, this "official list" of delegates was resisted by independent men belonging to the Republican party; but as the chairman was always in the interest of the Ring, he rarely failed so to jockey these Independents that even if they happened to have the majority present, they could not carry their candidates. Of course it seldom happened that they could bring a majority with them, while

argument would have been wasted on the crowd of employé and their friends with which the room was filled, and who were bound, some by the tenure of their office, others by the hope of getting office or work, to execute the behests of their political masters. The delegates chosen were usually office-holders, with a sprinkling of public works contractors, liquor-dealers, always a potent factor in ward politics, and office expectants. For instance, the Convention of 13th January, 1881, for nominating a candidate for mayor, consisted of 199 delegates, 86 of whom were connected with some branch of the city government, 9 were members of the city councils, 5 were police magistrates, 4 constables, and 23 policemen, while of the rest some were employed in some other city department, and some others were the known associates and dependants of the Ring. These delegates, assembled in convention of the party, duly went through the farce of selecting and voting for persons already determined on by the Ring as candidates for the chief offices. The persons so selected thereby became the authorized candidates of the party, for whom every good party man was expected to give his vote. Disgusted he might be to find a person unknown or known only for evil, perhaps a fraudulent bankrupt, or a broken-down bar keeper, proposed for his acceptance. But as his only alternative was to vote for the Democratic nominee who was probably no better, he submitted, and thus the party was forced to ratify the choice of the Boss. The possession of the great city offices gave the members of the Ring the means not only of making their own fortunes, but of amassing a large reserve fund to be used for "campaign purposes." Many of these offices were paid by fees and not by salary. Five officers were at one time in the receipt of an aggregate of $223,000, or an average of $44,600 each. One, the collector of delinquent taxes, received nearly $200,000 a year. Many others had the opportunity, by giving out contracts for public works on which they received large commissions, of enriching themselves almost without limit, because there was practically no investigation of their accounts.[1] The individual official was of course require

[1] In the suit subsequently instituted against the gas trustees, it was shown that in six years the trust had in cash losses, illegal transactions, and manufacturing losses due to corrupt management, involved the city in a expense of three and a half millions of dollars. These were the figures

o contribute to the secret party funds in proportion to his in-ome, and while he paid in thousands of dollars from his vast rivate gains, assessments were levied on the minor employés own to the very policemen. On one occasion each member of he police force was required to pay $25, and some afterwards further tax of $10, for party purposes. Any one who refused, nd much more, of course, any one who asserted his right to ote as he pleased, was promptly dismissed. The fund was pent in what is called "fixing things up," in canvassing, in etty bribery, in keeping bar-rooms open and supplying drink o the workers who resort thither, and, at election times, in ringing in armies of professional personators and repeaters om Washington, Baltimore, and other neighbouring cities, to vell the vote for the Ring nominees. These men, some of hem, it is said, criminals, others servants in the government epartments in the national capital, could, of course, have ef-cted little if the election officials and the police had looked harply after them. But those who presided at the voting laces were mostly in the plot, being Ring men and largely city mployés, while the police — and herein not less than in their oting power lies the value of a partisan police — had instruc-ons not to interfere with the strangers, but to allow them to ote as often as they pleased, while hustling away keen-eyed pponents.[1]

This kind of electioneering is costly, for secrecy must be ell paid for, and in other ways also the Ring was obliged to end heavily. Regarding each municipal department chiefly a means of accumulating subservien electors, it was always mpted to "create new voting-stock" (to use the technical pression), *i.e.* to appoint additional employés. This meant ditional salaries, so the taxpayers had the satisfaction of nowing that the sums they paid went to rivet on their necks e yoke of the bosses, just as a Greek tyrant exacted from e citizens money to hire the mercenaries who garrisoned the ropolis. And there was of course a vast deal of peculation

as ascertained in November, 1884. — *Report of the Committee of One ndred*, p. ii.

[1] A policeman is by law forbidden to approach within thirty feet of the er. Who was to see that the law was observed when the guardians of law broke it: according to the proverb, If water chokes, what is one to nk next?

in nearly all the departments; because clerks who had it in their power to disclose damaging secrets had little to fear, either from a superior or from the councilmen who had procured their appointment. Thus the debt of the city swelled rapidly. In 1860 it stood at about $20,000,000 (£4,000,000). In 1881 it had reached $70,000,000 (£14,000,000). Taxation rose in proportion, till in 1881 it amounted to between one-fourth and one-third of the net income from the property on which it was assessed, although that property was rated at nearly its full value.[1] Yet withal, the city was badly paved, badly cleansed, badly supplied with gas (for which a high price was charged) and with water.[2] That such a burden should have been borne, with so little to show for it, was all the more surprising, because in Philadelphia there is a larger number of well-to-do working-people, owning the houses they live in, than in any other city of the Union.[3] It might have been expected, therefore, that since the evils of heavy rating and bad administration pressed directly on an unusually large number of electors, the discontent would have been universal, the demand for reform overwhelming.[4]

But how was reform to be effected? Three methods presented themselves. One was to proceed against the Gas Trustees and other peculators in the courts of the State. But to make out a case, the facts must first be ascertained, the accounts examined. Now the city departments did not publish all their accounts, or published them in a misleading and incomplete form. The powers which should have scrutinized them and compelled a fuller disclosure, were vested in the councils of the city, acting by their standing committees. But these councils were mainly composed of members or nominees of the Ring, who had a direct interest in suppressing inquiry, because they either shared the profits of dishonesty, or had placed their own relatives and friends in municipal employment by bargain

[1] I take these facts from an interesting paper on the *Form of Municipal Government for Philadelphia*, by Mr. John C. Bullitt, Philadelphia, 1882.

[2] See Chapter LI., p. 606 of Vol. I.

[3] There were in Philadelphia in 1886, 90,000 individual owners of real estate constituting more than a majority of all the votes ever cast in an election.

[4] During a considerable part of the time the enormous annual expenditure for "city improvements" was defrayed out of fresh loans, so the citizens did not realize the burden that was being laid on them.

ith the peculating heads of departments. They therefore fused to move, and voted down the proposals for investi- tion made by a few of their more public-spirited col- agues.[1]

Another method was to turn out the corrupt officials at the xt election. The American system of short terms and pop- ar elections was originally due to a distrust of the officials, d expressly designed to enable the people to recall misused wers. The astuteness of professional politicians had, how- er, made it unavailable. Good citizens could not hope to rry candidates of their own against the tainted nominees of e Ring, because the latter having the "straight" or "regular" rty nominations would command the vote of the great mass ordinary party men, so that the only effect of voting against em would at best be to let in the candidates of the opposite, the Democratic, party. Those candidates were usually no tter than the Republican Ring nominees, so where was the in? And the same reason, joined to party hostility, forbade od Republicans to vote for Democratic candidates. The mocrats, to be sure, might have taken advantage of Repub- an discontent by nominating really good men, who would in at case have been carried by the addition of the Republican olting" vote to the regular Democratic vote. But the Dem- ratic wire-pullers, being mostly men of the same stamp as e Gas Ring, did not seek a temporary gain at the expense of permanent disparagement of their own class. Political inciples are the last thing which the professional city poli- ian cares for. It was better worth the while of the Demo- tic chiefs to wait for their turn, and in the meantime to get nething out of occasional bargains with their (nominal)

[1] A friend in Philadelphia writes me: — "It might be thought that the power election vested in the councils would enable the latter to control the trustees, when 'politics' invaded the trust, a vicious circle speedily established lf, and the trust controlled the councils. Its enormous pay-roll enabled it employ numerous 'workers' in each of the 600 or 700 election divisions of city, and aspirants for seats in the councils found it almost impossible to ain either nomination or election without the favour of the trust. Thus councils became filled with its henchmen or 'heelers,' submissive to its ling, not only in the selection of trustees to fill the four yearly vacancies, in every detail of city government with which the leaders of the trust ired to interfere. It is easy to understand the enormous possibilities of er created by such a position."

Republican opponents, than to strengthen the cause of goo government at the expense of the professional class.[1]

The third avenue to reform lay through the action of th State legislature. It might have ordered an inquiry into th municipal government of Philadelphia, or passed a statute pu viding for the creation of a better system. But this aven was closed even more completely than the other two by th control which the City Ring exercised over the State legisla ure. The Pennsylvania House of Representatives was noto ously a tainted body, and the Senate no better, or perha worse. The Philadelphia politicians, partly by their comma of the Philadelphia members, partly by the other inducemen at their command, were able to stop all proceedings in th legislature hostile to themselves, and did in fact, as will a pear presently, frequently balk the efforts which the reforme made in that quarter. It was enough for their purpose command one House; indeed it was practically enough command the committee of that one House to which a measu is referred. The facilities for delay are such that a reformi bill can be stifled without the need of open opposition.

This was the condition of the Quaker City with its 850,0 people; these the difficulties reformers had to encounter. L us see how they proceeded.

In 1870, a bill was passed by the State legislature at Harr burg, at the instigation of the City Ring, then in the first flu of youthful hope and energy, creating a Public Buildings Co mission for the city of Philadelphia, a body with an unlimit term of office, with power to enlarge its numbers, and fill vacancies among its members, to tax the city and to spend t revenue so raised on buildings, practically without restricti or supervision. When this Act, which had been passed in o day through both Houses, without having been even print came to the knowledge of the better class of citizens, ala arose, and an agitation was set on foot for its abrogation. public meeting was held in March, 1871, a committee form with instructions to proceed to Harrisburg, and have the A repealed. The committee went to Harrisburg and urged me

[1] It was generally believed in February, 1881, that the Democratic bo had made a bargain (for valuable consideration) with the Gas Ring no nominate Mr. Hunter, the reformers' candidate, for the receivership of tax

rs of both Houses to support a repealing bill introduced into e State Senate. In May this bill passed the Senate, in which ere was then a Democratic majority, five Republican mem- rs voting for it. However, a committee of the (Republican) ouse of Representatives reported against the repeal, influ- ced by interested persons from Philadelphia, and (as is gen- lly believed) influenced by arguments weightier than words; the Commission was maintained in force. The incident l, however, so far roused a few of the better class of Repub- ans, that they formed a Municipal Reform Association, ose career has been summarized for me by an eminent citi- n of Philadelphia, in the words which follow: —

'The Association laboured earnestly to check the tide of misgovern- nt. Its task was a difficult one, for the passions aroused by the war re still vigorous, the reconstruction in progress in the South kept parti- ship at a white heat, and fealty to party obligations was regarded as a red duty by nearly all classes. Consequently it had no newspaper sup- t to depend upon, and as a rule it met with opposition from the leaders both political organizations. Moreover, the laws regulating the registry voters and the conduct of elections had been so framed as to render ud easy and detection difficult. Undeterred by these obstacles, the ociation set itself vigorously to work; it held public meetings, it issued resses and tracts, it placed tickets in the field consisting of the better didates of either party, and when neither had made passable nomina- ns for an office, it put forward those of its own. It continued in active stence for three or four years, and accomplished much of what it set to do. Occasionally it succeeded in defeating specially objectionable didates, and in electing better men to the city councils; the increase he public debt was checked, the credit of the city was improved, and nomy began to be practised in some of the departments; salaries were stituted for fees in the public offices; the election laws were revised, honest elections became possible; prosecutions were instituted against nders, and enough convictions were secured to serve as a wholesome ning. The services of the Association were especially apparent in directions. It contributed largely to the agitations which secured the ing of a convention in 1873 to revise the State constitution, it had a tary influence with the convention, and it aided in obtaining the rati- ion of the new constitution by the people. Still more important was uccess in arousing the public conscience, and in training a class of in- endent voters, who gradually learned to cast their ballots without rd to so-called party fealty. It thus opened the way for all subse- nt reforms, and when its members, wearied with its thankless task, by one withdrew, and the Association disbanded, they could feel that only was the condition of the city materially improved, but that their

successors in the Sisyphean labour would have a lighter burden and less rugged ascent to climb. One important result of the attention whic they had drawn to municipal mismanagement was the passage of an a of the legislature, under which, in 1877, the governor of the State appoint a commission of eleven persons to devise a plan for the government cities. This commission made a report proposing valuable improvement and submitted it, with a bill embodying their suggestions, to the Sta legislature in 1878. The legislature, however, at the bidding of t Rings, for Pittsburg and other cities have their Rings as well as Philade phia, smothered the bill, and all efforts to pass it failed till 1885."

In the course of 1880, the horizon began to clear.[1] Sever honest and outspoken men who had found their way into t two councils of the city, denounced the prevailing corruptio and by demands of inquiry began to rouse the citizens. correspondent of a New York paper obtained facts about t management of the Gas Trust which, when published, to seriously on opinion. At the November election, while Phil delphia cast a heavy vote in favour of General Garfield Republican candidate for the Presidency, and for the Repub can nominees for the offices of State Auditor-General, and jud of the State Supreme Court, she returned as City Controll a young Democrat, who having, with the help of the Muni pal Reform Association, found his way into that office at t last preceding election, had signalized himself by uprightne and independence. The Republican bosses did their utmo against him, but the vote of independents among the Repub cans, joined to that of the Democratic party (whose boss although secretly displeased with his conduct, did not oper throw him over), carried him in. Thirteen days afterwar under the impulse of this struggle, an energetic citizen co vened a meeting of leading merchants to set on foot a mo ment for choosing good men at the elections due in Februa 1881. This meeting created a committee of one hundred bu ness men, including a large number of persons bearing t oldest and most respected names in Philadelphia. All w Republicans, and at first they endeavoured to effect th

[1] In the narrative which follows I have derived much assistance from a li book by Mr. George Vickers, entitled *The Fall of Bossism* (Philadelp 1883), which, with some oddities of style, contains many instructive det of the doings of the Bosses and the Reform Campaign. Some information to Ring methods in Philadelphia may also be gathered from a lively sa published anonymously, entitled *Solid for Mulhooly* (New York, 1881).

rposes by means, and within the limits, of the Republican
ty. They prepared a declaration of principles, containing
ir programme of municipal reform, and resolved to support
candidate who would not sign it. Soon the time came for
king nominations for the three offices to be filled up, viz.,
se of mayor, receiver of taxes, and city solicitor. For mayor,
"regular" Republican party, controlled by Mr. M'Manes,
ninated Mr. Stokley, who was then in office, a man against
om no fraud could be charged, but whose management of
police force and subservience to the Boss had made him
pected by earnest reformers. At first, in the belief that he
s prepared to subscribe their declaration, the One Hundred
e him their nomination; but when it turned out that he,
uenced by the Ring, refused to do so, they withdrew their
dorsement," and perceived that the time had come for a
der course. Since they must resist the Ring Republicans,
y invited the co-operation of the Democratic party in choos-
a good man. The novelty of the circumstances, and the
portunity of doing a good stroke for their party and their
at once, brought to the front the best element among the
nocrats. Overruling their bosses by a sudden movement,
Democratic convention nominated Mr. King for the mayor-
, a bold and honest man, whom, though a Democrat, the
mittee of One Hundred promptly accepted. For the not
important office of receiver of taxes, the One Hundred
nominated Mr. Hunter, a Republican, who had approved
public spirit by upright service in the common council.
Ring Republicans had taken for their candidate an un-
wn man, supposed to be a creature of Mr. M'Manes; and
rything now turned on the conduct of the Democratic nom-
ing convention. It was strongly urged by the feeling of
people to accept Mr. Hunter. But the Democratic bosses
no mind to help a reformer, and even among the better
, the old dislike to supporting a person belonging to the
osite party was strong. A passionate struggle in the Dem-
tic convention, round whose doors a vast and eager crowd
gathered, resulted in the carrying by a small majority of
gular party candidate named M'Grath against Mr. Hunter.
reupon the delegates who supported Hunter seceded, and
ched, escorted and cheered by excited crowds, to the rooms

of the One Hundred, where they organized themselves afresh as an Independent convention, and nominated Hunter. Immense enthusiasm was evoked in both parties by this novel and unexpectedly bold action. Independent Democrats organized clubs and committees in Hunter's cause, and the movement spread so fast that ten days before the election M'Grath retired, leaving the regular Democrats free to cast their votes for the Republican Hunter, along with the Democratic King. Only one chance was now left to the Gas Ring — the lavish expenditure of money, and the resort to election frauds. They assessed the police, about 1300 in number, $20 a head to replenish the campaign fund, levying assessments on the other city departments also. Preparations for repeating and ballot box stuffing were made as in former days, but the energy of the One Hundred, who, while they issued a circular to clergymen of all denominations, requesting them to preach sermons on the duty of electors, issued also notices threatening prosecution against any one guilty of an election fraud, and organized a large force of volunteer citizens to look after the police. so much frightened the Ringsters and their dependents, that the voting was conducted with fairness and purity. The excitement on the polling day was unprecedented in municipal politics, and the success of the reform candidates who were chosen, King by a majority of six thousand, Hunter by twenty thousand, was welcomed with transports of joy. Astræa had returned — the "City of Independence" was again a city of freedom.

The committee of One Hundred, to whose efforts the victory was mainly due, was kept on foot to carry on and perfect the work of reform. It recommended candidates at the spring and fall elections during the three years that followed, obtaining for them a measure of success encouraging, no doubt, yet less complete than had been expected. It retained counsel to aid in a suit instituted against the Gas Trustees, which resulted in disclosing scandalous waste and fraud, and led to a great improvement in the management of that department. It induced the State legislature to reduce the salaries of a number of over-paid officials, and to place on a permanent basis the salaries of judges which had hitherto been voted annually. The Mayor, whom it had carried in 1881, stopped the assess

ent of the police for "campaign purposes," and rigidly estrained them from joining in the nominating conventions r interfering with voters at the polls. The tax office was eorganized by the new Receiver, and the income which its mployés depleted turned into the city treasury. The system f banking city moneys, which had been used for political purposes, was reformed under an ordinance of the city councils, ecured by the efforts of the committee. The lists of voters, hich had been carelessly and sometimes corruptly made up, ere set to rights, and capable men appointed assessors instead f the ward politicians, often illiterate, to whom this duty had een previously entrusted. An inspector of highways was ngaged by the committee to report cases in which contractors ere failing to do the work in repairing streets and drains for hich they were paid, and frauds were unearthed by which he city had been robbed of hundreds of thousands of dollars. ross abuses in the management of the city almshouse and ospital were revealed; a new administration was installed, hich in its first year saved the city $80,000; while the conction and imprisonment of the chief offenders struck wholeome terror into evil-doers in other departments. Finally, the ommittee undertook the prosecution of a large number of ersons accused of fraud, repeating, personation, violence, tampering with ballot-boxes, and other election offences, and by onvicting some and driving others from the city, so much duced these misdemeanours that in the end of 1883 the city ections were pronounced to show a clean bill of health.[1]

Work so various and so difficult cost the members of the ommittee of One Hundred, who were nearly all men actively ngaged in business, and had passed a self-denying ordinance nding themselves to accept no personal political advantage, n infinitude of time and trouble. Accordingly, when they und that the candidates, whom they had recommended at he election of February, 1884, had been rejected in favour of her candidates, who made similar professions of reform, but emed less likely, from their past history, to fulfil those pro-

[1] The committee observe in the Report that the party organization of the y, in nearly every instance, did its utmost by supplying bail, employing ansel, and rendering other assistance to protect the culprits, who were garded as sufferers for the sake of their party.

fessions, they determined to wind up and dissolve the committee. It had done great things, and its failure to carry its candidates at this last election was due partly to the intrusion into municipal politics of the national issue of the protective tariff (the most burning of all questions to Philadelphians), partly to that languor which creeps over voters who fancy that by doing their duty strenuously for some years they have mortally wounded the power of corruption and need not keep up the fight till it is stone dead.

A recent authority sums up the situation thus: —

"The committee of One Hundred fought the Ring at every point and at all points for city and county officers, the council, and the legislature, the plan being to unite for the nominations of the two great parties and endorse one or the other of the candidates, or even nominate candidates of their own. They sent tickets to every citizen, and created the class of 'vest-pocket voters' — men who come to the polls with their tickets made up, to the confusion of 'the boys.' They changed for a while the complexion of councils, elected a reform mayor and receiver of taxes, caused the repeal of the infamous Delinquent Tax Collections Bill, and the equally notorious and obnoxious Recorder's Bill, and generally made a more decent observance of the law necessary throughout the city. In its nature, however, the remedy was esoteric and revolutionary, and therefore necessarily ephemeral. It could not retain the spoils system and thereby attract the workers. Its candidates, when elected, often betrayed it and went over to the regulars, who, they foresaw, had more staying qualities. Its members became tired of the thankless task of spending time and money in what must be a continuous, unending battle. The people became restive, and refused their support to what jarred on their conservative ideas, and what they were pleased to call the dictation of an autocratic, self-constituted body. The cry was raised: 'Who made thee a ruler and judge over us?'

"In 1883 the committee's candidate for controller was defeated in a pitched battle, and the following spring the reform mayor was beaten by over 7000 votes by the most advanced type of a machine politician, who has since been impeached by his own party in Common Council for pecuniary malfeasance." [1]

The above extract was written in 1883. Since that year there have been changes for the better in the city administration of Philadelphia, which I touch on but briefly, since it is to the Gas Ring episode that this chapter is specially

[1] Mr. E. P. Allinson and Mr. B. Penrose, in an article on "City Government in Philadelphia." For a history of municipal government in the city, reference may be made to the treatise, "Philadelphia, 1681-1887," of the same authors.

evoted. A bill for reforming municipal government by the nactment of a new city charter, approved by the One Hun- red, came before the State legislature in 1883. It was there nothered by the professionals at the instance of the Gas ing. When it reappeared in the legislature of 1885 circum- ances were more favourable. The relations between the ate Boss of Pennsylvania and the City Ring headed by Boss 'Manes were strained. The State Boss seems, while wish- g to cripple the City Ring by cutting off some of its patron- e, to have thought that it would be well to conciliate the od citizens of Philadelphia by giving his powerful support a reform measure. He was the more drawn to this course cause the Mayor of Philadelphia, whose appointing power uld be enlarged by the bill, was, although not a "high-class litician," far from friendly to the Gas Trust. Long discus- ons of the bill in the press and at meetings had produced me effect even on the State legislature at Harrisburg; nor as there wanting in that body a small section of good mem- rs willing to help reform forward. Many leaders and most wspapers had in the course of the discussions been led to mmit themselves to an approval of the bill, while not expect- g it to pass. Thus, in 1885, the opposition in the legislature ased to be open and direct, and came to turn on the question nen the bill, if passed, should take effect. Its promoters udently agreed to let its operation be delayed till 1887; and ving thus "squared" some of their opponents, and out- nœuvred others, they ran it through. Public opinion and a ghteous cause counted for something in this triumph, but en public opinion and righteousness might have failed but r the feud between Mr. M'Manes and the State Boss.

The new city charter has worked for good. By bringing gas nagement under the control of the city executive, it extin- ished the separate Gas Trust, and therewith quenched the ht of Mr. M'Manes, who ceased to be formidable when his tronage departed, and has now become "a back number." nicipal administration has gained by the concentration of wer and responsibility in the mayor and the executive heads departments whom he appoints. The Councils, however, still bad bodies, few of the members respected, many of em corrupt. They are still nominated by a clique of machine

politicians, and this clique they obey, paying some regard to the interests of their respective wards, but none to those of the city. Reformers think that to give them a salary might lessen their temptations, since it seems impossible to raise their tone. In the stead of Mr. M'Manes, the State Boss now reigns through his lieutenants; and so tight is his grip of the city that when, in 1890, the suspicions he aroused had provoked a popular uprising which overthrew his nominee for the State governorship, turning over to the other party some thirty thousand votes, he was still able to hold Philadelphia — rich, educated, staid, pious Philadelphia — by a large majority. Elections continue to be tainted with fraud and bribery; the politicians still refuse the enactment of adequate laws for a secret ballot and the publication of election expenses. Perhaps the most menacing power is that wielded by the great local corporations, including the railroad and tramway or street-car companies. Whether by the use of money, or, as is thought more probable, by influencing the votes of their employés, or by both methods, these corporations seem to hold the councils in the hollow of their hands. One of them lately secured from the city legislature, at a merely nominal figure, a public franchise, which, while it made the streets more dangerous, added to the market price of its stock about $6,600,000. And this was done by a two-thirds majority over the veto of the mayor, in the teeth of an active agitation conducted by the most worthy citizens. Against scandals like this the best city charter furnishes little protection. They can be cured only by getting upright Councils, and these again can be secured only by having free instead of cooked nominations, honest elections, and a far more constantly active interest in the welfare of city than the mass of the voters have hitherto evinced. Philadelphia is not the only city in which private corporations have proved more than a match for public interests, and in which such corporations have netted immense profits, that ought to have gone to reduce the burdens of the people.[1]

Against these evils a strenuous campaign has been con

[1] It is stated by the Municipal League that the city has of recent years lost as much as $50,000,000 by improvident grants of valuable purchases to street railroad companies.

ucted by various associations of "good citizens," some perma-
ent, some formed for a special occasion. Two such, of which
is enough to say that they are worthy successors of the
ommittee of One Hundred, are now at work. They include
early all those in whom high personal character is united
a sense of public duty. But their members have hitherto
rmed so small a proportion of the voters that it is only when
me glaringly bad candidate is nominated or outrageous job
erpetrated that their efforts tell in an election.

The European reader will have found four things surprising
the foregoing narrative — the long-suffering of the tax-
yers up till 1881; the strength of party loyalty, even in
unicipal affairs where no political principle is involved; the
traordinary efforts required to induce the voters to protect
eir pockets by turning a gang of plunderers out of office;
d the tendency of the old evils to reappear as soon as the
dour of the voters cools. He will be all the more surprised
hen he learns that most of the corrupt leaders in Philadel-
ia are not Irishmen, but Americans born and bred, and that
none of the larger cities is the percentage of recent immi-
ants so small. The general causes of municipal misgovern-
ent have been discussed in preceding chapters, but it may be
ell to repeat that the existence of universal suffrage in a city of
million of people imposes a vast amount of work on those who
uld win an election. Nothing but a very complete and very
tive ward organization, an organization which knows every
use in every street, and drops upon the new voter from
urope as soon as residence and the oath have made him a
tizen, can grapple with the work of bringing up these multi-
des to the poll. It was their command of this local organi-
tion, their practice in working it, the fact that their employés
ere a trained and disciplined body whose chief business
as to work it — services in the gas or water or some other
partment being a mere excuse for paying the "workers"
salary — that gave the Gas Ring and its astute head their
ld upon the voting power of the city, which all the best
epublicans, with frequent aid from the Democrats, found it
hard to shake. It is the cohesion of this organization, the
difference of the bulk of its members to issues of municipal
licy and their responsiveness to party names and cries, that

enables the henchmen of the State Boss now to wield that power, and with impunity to sacrifice the interests of the city to those of rich and vote-controlling corporations.

The moral of the whole story is, however, best given in the words of four eminent Philadelphians. I multiply testimonies because Philadelphia is a peculiarly instructive instance of the evils which everywhere infect municipal government. Her social and economic conditions are far more favourable than those of New York or Chicago, and the persistence of those evils in her is, therefore, a more alarming symptom than the grosser scandals which have disgraced those cities with their masses of recent immigrants.

Two of them wrote me as follows in 1888. One said: —

"Those who study these questions most critically and think the most carefully, fear most for the Republic from the indifference of the better classes than the ignorance of the lower classes. We hear endless talk about the power of the Labour vote, the Irish vote, the German vote, the Granger vote, but no combination at the ballot-box to-day is as numerous or powerful as the stay-at-home vote. The sceptre which is stronger to command than any other is passed by unnoticed, not because outworn in conflict, but because rusted and wasted in neglect. The primary, the caucus, and the convention are the real rulers of America, and the hand which guides these is the master. Here again the stay-at-home vote is still more responsible. In New York City in 1885 there were 266,000 voters; of these 201,000 voted at the regular election, and between 20,000 and 25,000 voted at the primary. This proportion would hold good the country over, and it appears that one out of every four does not vote at all, and nine out of every ten do not attend the primaries. It can therefore easily be seen that it is very easy to control the primaries, and granting strong party fealty how difficult it is to run an independent ticket against the machine."

The other, Mr. Henry C. Lea, the distinguished historian said: —

"Your expression of surprise at the mal-administration of Philadelphia is thoroughly justified. In existing social conditions it would be difficult to conceive of a large community of which it would appear more safe to predicate judicious self-government than ours. Nowhere is there to be found a more general diffusion of property or a higher average standard of comfort and intelligence — nowhere so large a proportion of landowners bearing the burden of direct taxation, and personally interested in the wise and honest expenditure of the public revenue. In these respects it is almost an ideal community to which to work out practical results from

democratic theories. I have often speculated as to the causes of failure without satisfying myself with any solution. It is not attributable to manhood suffrage, for in my reform labours I have found that the most dangerous enemies of reform have not been the ignorant and poor, but men of wealth, of high social position and character, who had nothing personally to gain from political corruption, but who showed themselves as unfitted to exercise the right of suffrage as the lowest proletariat, by allowing their partisanship to enlist them in the support of candidates notoriously bad who happened by control of party machinery to obtain the 'regular' nominations.

"The nearest approach which I can make to an explanation is that the spirit of party blinds many, while still more are governed by the mental inertia which renders independent thought the most laborious of tasks, and the selfish indolence which shrinks from interrupting the daily routine of avocations. In a constituency so enormous the most prolonged and strenuous effort is required to oppose the ponderous and complicated machinery of party organization, which is always in the hands of professional politicians who obtain control over it by a process of natural selection, and who thus are perfectly fitted for the work. Recalcitrants are raw militia who take the field with overwhelming odds against them, both in numbers and discipline. Even though they may gain an occasional victory, their enthusiasm exhausts itself and they return to more congenial labours, while the 'regular' is always on duty, and knows, with Philip II., that time and he can overcome any other two."

A third writes in 1893: —

"The great majority of the voters take no interest in local politics. They refuse to attend the party primaries, and can rarely be induced to do more than spend a few minutes once a year in voting at city elections. Many refuse to vote at all, or yield only to corrupt inducements or to the solicitations of interested friends. The result is that combinations of unworthy leaders and mercenary henchmen are enabled to control the nominating conventions of both parties; and when election day comes, the people can do nothing but choose between two tickets dictated by equally corrupt men and nominated by similar methods. . . . I do not therefore look for progress towards an honest and intelligent conduct of municipal business until a considerable part of the now indifferent voters can be roused to a careful consideration of the subject, and convinced of the importance of organizing for the nomination of better candidates, and for the exclusion of national issues and national parties from municipal contests."

A fourth, writing in 1894, observes: —

"The most characteristic feature of the situation is the supremacy of the Republican party, which has an immense majority in the city. Politically, therefore, the controlling party managers and the class from which reform leaders might be expected to come are in accord (manu-

facturing interests being the most important); and the advantages to be derived by persons in business in a large way from standing well with the managers of the dominant party are sufficiently great to check in no small degree individual inclination to strive for better conditions. As elsewhere in America, it is not the natural leaders in the community, the men who have succeeded in business or in the professions, who are party leaders, but men who are of no importance in any other connection. This fastens upon us an impersonal rule, those who exercise it not being influenced by public opinion, which would certainly act as a restraint upon men of standing. . . . The councils are dominated by the party managers who nominated them, and corporations who pay wages, in one way or another, to a considerable portion of the members. The city charter of 1885 is a good one, and we should look not so much for more legislation as for some means of stimulating the people to take a common-sense view of municipal government and realize their responsibility for it.

Philadelphia has just erected a magnificent city hall, the largest and finest building of its kind in the United States, with a tower, 537 feet in height, which far overtops Cologne Cathedral and the Pyramid of Cheops and St. Peter's at Rome. The thoughts of the traveller who is taken to admire it naturally turn to what goes on beneath its ample roof, and he asks whether the day will arrive when Philadelphian voters will take to heart the painful lessons of the past, and when the officials who reign in this municipal palace will become worthy of so superb a dwelling and of the city where the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution first saw the light. His Philadelphian friends reply that such a day will doubtless arrive. But they admit that it seems still distant.

CHAPTER XC

KEARNEYISM IN CALIFORNIA

I. The Character of California

What America is to Europe, what Western America is to stern, that California is to the other Western States. The aracteristics of a new and quickly developed colonial civiliza- n are all strongly marked. It is thoroughly American, but st so in those points wherein the Old World differs from the w. Large fortunes are swiftly made and not less swiftly nt. Changes of public sentiment are sudden and violent. e most active minds are too much absorbed in great business terprises to attend to politics; the inferior men are frequently kless and irresponsible; the masses are impatient, accustomed blame everything and everybody but themselves for the slow proach of the millennium, ready to try instant, even if peril- , remedies for a present evil.

These features belong more or less to all the newer and gher commonwealths. Several others are peculiar to Cali- nia — a State on which I dwell the more willingly because it n many respects the most striking in the whole Union, and more than any other the character of a great country, able of standing alone in the world. It has immense wealth its fertile soil as well as in its minerals and forests. Nature nowhere more imposing nor her beauties more varied.

t grew up, after the cession by Mexico and the discovery of d, like a gourd in the night. A great population had gathered ore there was any regular government to keep it in order, ch less any education or social culture to refine it. The dness of that time passed into the blood of the people, and left them more tolerant of violent deeds, more prone to erferences with, or supersessions of, regular law, than are the ple of most parts of the Union.

The chief occupation of the first generation of Californi was mining, an industry which is like gambling in its influe on the character, with its sudden alternations of wealth poverty, its long hours of painful toil relieved by bouts drinking and merriment, its life in a crowd of men who h come together from the four winds of heaven, and will sca again as soon as some are enriched and others ruined, or gold in the gulch is exhausted. Moreover, mining in this reg means gambling, not only in camps among the miners, among townsfolk in the shares of the mining companies. C fornians of all classes have formed the habit of buying selling in the mining exchanges, with effects on the popu temper both in business and in politics which every one understand. Speculation becomes a passion, patient industr distasteful; there is bred a recklessness and turbulence in inner life of the man which does not fail to express itsel acts.

When California was ceded to the United States, l speculators bought up large tracts under Spanish titles, others, foreseeing the coming prosperity, subsequently acqu great domains by purchase, either from the railways which received land grants, or directly from the government. S of these speculators, by holding their lands for a rise, mad difficult for immigrants to acquire small freeholds, and in s cases checked the growth of farms. Others let their land short leases to farmers, who thus came into a comparati precarious and often necessitous condition; others establis enormous farms, in which the soil is cultivated by h labourers, many of whom are discharged after the harvest phenomenon rare in the United States, which, as everyb knows, is a country of moderately sized farms, owned by sons who do most of their labour by their own and their dren's hands. Thus the land system of California pres features both peculiar and dangerous, a contrast between g properties, often appearing to conflict with the general w and the sometimes hard-pressed smaller farmer, together a mass of unsettled labour, thrown without work into the to at certain times of the year.[1]

Everywhere in the West the power of the railways

[1] "Latifundia perdunt Californiam," some one said to me in San Franc

cited the jealousy of the people. In California, however, it s roused most hostility, because no State has been so much the mercy of one powerful corporation. The Central Pacific ilway, whose main line extends from San Francisco to gden in Utah, where it meets the Union Pacific and touches e Denver and Rio Grande system, had been up till 1877, ien my narrative begins, the only route to the Mississippi lley and Atlantic,[1] and therefore possessed immense in- ence over the trade of the whole State. It was controlled a small knot of men who had risen from insignificance affluence, held nearly all the other railway lines in Cali- nia, employed an enormous number of clerks and work- n, and made the weight of their hand felt wherever their erest was involved. Alike as capitalists, as potentates, and men whose rise to gigantic wealth seemed due as much to e growth of the State as to their own abilities, and there- re to come under the principle which is called in England it of the "unearned increment," they excited irritation among e farming and trading class, as well as among the labourers. great fortunes have in America been usually won by unusual ts, any envy they can excite is tempered by admiration for e ability shown in acquiring them. The common people felt ind of pride in the late Mr. A. T. Stewart, and perhaps even that flagrant "monopolist," Mr. Jay Gould. But while se particular railway magnates were men of talent, there re also in California millionaires who had grown rich merely lucky speculation. They displayed their wealth with a gar and unbecoming ostentation. They did not, as rich n nearly always do in the Atlantic States, bestow a large t of it on useful public objects. There was therefore noth- to break the wave of suspicious dislike.

Most of the Western States have been peopled by a steady ux of settlers from two or three older States. Minnesota, instance, and Iowa have grown by the overflow of Illinois Ohio, as well as by immigration direct from Europe. But ifornia was filled by a sudden rush of adventurers from all ts of the world. They arrived mostly *via* Panama, for there

[1] There are now four other transcontinental trunk lines, but two of them ar to the north, and another belongs to the same group of men who have rolled the Central Pacific.

was no transcontinental railway till 1869, and a great many came from the Southern States. This mixed multitude, bringing with it a variety of manners, customs, and ideas, formed a society more mobile and unstable, less governed by fixed beliefs and principles, than one finds in such North-western communities as I have just mentioned. Living far away from the steadying influences of the Eastern States, the Californians have developed, and are proud of having done so, a sort of Pacific type, which, though differing but slightly from the usual Western type, has less of the English element than one discovers in the American who lives on the Atlantic side of the Rocky Mountains. Add to this that California is the last place to the west before you come to Japan. That scum which the westward moving wave of emigration carries on its crest is here stopped, because it can go no farther. It accumulates in San Francisco, and forms a dangerous constituent in the population of that great and growing city — a population perhaps more mixed than one finds anywhere else in America, for Frenchmen, Italians, Portuguese, Greeks, and the children of Australian convicts abound there, side by side with negroes, Germans, and Irish. Of the Chinese one need not speak; for though they numbered in 1880 some twelve thousand, have a large quarter to themselves, and have given rise to the dominant question in Pacific coast politics, they do not themselves join in any political movement, but mingle as little with the whites as oil with water.

California, more than any other part of the Union, is a country by itself, and San Francisco a capital. Cut off from the more populous parts of the Mississippi valley by an almost continuous desert of twelve hundred miles, across which the two daily trains move like ships across the ocean, separated from Oregon on the north by a wilderness of sparsely settled mountain and forest, it has grown up in its own way and acquired a sort of consciousness of separate existence. San Francisco dwarfs the other cities, and is a commercial and intellectual centre and source of influence for the surrounding regions, more powerful over them than is any Eastern city over its neighbourhood. It is a New York which has got no Boston on one side of it, and no shrewd and orderly rural population on the other to keep it in order. Hence both State

d city are less steadied by national opinion than any other ate or city within the wide compass of the Union.

These facts in Californian history must be borne in mind in der to understand the events I am about to sketch.[1] They ow how suited is her soil to revolutionary movements. They ggest that movements natural here are less likely to arise in her parts of the Union.

II. The Sand Lot Party

In 1877 California was suffering from "hard times." The vere commercial depression which began in the Eastern ates in 1873, and touched the lowest point about 1876, had ached the Pacific coast, and was aggravated there by a heavy l in mining stocks. The great Bonanza finds some years fore had ushered in a period of wild speculation. Everybody mbled in stocks, from railroad kings down to maidservants. ocks had now fallen, and everybody was hard hit. The lroad kings could stand their losses, but the clerks and shop sistants and workmen suffered, for their savings were gone d many were left heavily in debt, with their houses mort-ged and no hope of redemption. Trade was bad, work was rce, and for what there was of it the Chinese, willing to take ly half the ordinary wages, competed with the white la-rer. The mob of San Francisco, swelled by disappointed ners from the camps and labourers out of work, men lured m distant homes by the hope of wealth and ease in the land gold, saw itself on the verge of starvation, while the splen-mansions of speculators, who fifteen years before had kept

[1] The narrative which follows does not profess to be complete, for the culty of procuring adequate data was very great. When I visited San ncisco in 1881, and again in 1883, people were unwilling to talk about the rney agitation, feeling, it seemed to me, rather ashamed of it, and annoyed so much should have been made of it (more, they declared, than it rved) in the Eastern States. When I asked how I could learn the facts in il, they answered, "Only by reading through the files of the newspapers the years 1877–80 inclusive." Some added, that there were so many lies he newspapers that I would not have got at the facts even then. Failing method, I was obliged to rely on what I could pick up in conversation. ve, however, derived some assistance from a brilliant article by Mr. Henry rge, who was then a resident of San Francisco, in the *Popular Science thly* for August, 1880.

little shops, rose along the heights of the city, and the news papers reported their luxurious banquets. In the country th farmers were scarcely less discontented. They, too, had "gon into stocks," their farms were mortgaged, and many of the were bankrupt. They complained that the railroads crushe them by heavy freight rates, and asked why they, the bon and sinew of the country, should toil without profit, whil local millionaires and wealthy Eastern bondholders drew larg incomes from the traffic which the plough of the agriculturis and the pickaxe of the miner had created.

Both in the country and in the city there was disgust wit politics and the politicians. The legislature was composed a most wholly either of office-seekers from the city or of petty country lawyers, needy and narrow-minded men. Those wh had virtue enough not to be "got at" by the great corporations had not intelligence enough to know how to resist their devices It was a common saying in the State that each successive leg islature was worse than its predecessor. The meeting of th representatives of the people was seen with anxiety, thei departure with relief. Some opprobrious epithet was bestowe upon each. One was, "the legislature of a thousand drinks" another, "the legislature of a thousand steals." County gover ment was little better; city government was even worse. Th judges were not corrupt, but most of them, as was natura considering the scanty salaries assigned to them, were inferi men, not fit to cope with the counsel who practised before the Partly owing to the weakness of juries, partly to the intric cies of the law and the defects of the recently adopted cod criminal justice was halting and uncertain, and malefacto often went unpunished. It became a proverb that you migh safely commit a murder if you took the advice of the be lawyers.

Neither Democrats nor Republicans had done, or seeme likely to do, anything to remove these evils or to improve th lot of the people. They were only seeking (so men though places or the chance of jobs for themselves, and could alwa be bought by a powerful corporation. Working men mu help themselves; there must be new methods and a new d parture. Everything, in short, was ripe for a demagogu Fate was kind to the Californians in sending them a dem

gue of a common type, noisy and confident, but with neither litical foresight nor constructive talent.

Late in 1877 a meeting was called in San Francisco to ex- ess sympathy with the men on strike at Pittsburg in Penn- vania. Their riotous violence, which had alarmed the pectable classes all over America, had gratified the discon- ted railroad operatives of California, then meditating a ike of their own against a threatened reduction of wages. me strong language used at this meeting, and exaggerated the newspapers, frightened the business men into forming ort of committee of public safety, with the president of the nous Vigilance Committee of 1856, a resolute and capable n, at its head. Persons enrolled by it paraded the streets h sticks for some days to prevent any attack on the Chinese, t it was soon perceived that there was no real danger, and chief result of the incident was further irritation of the rer classes, who perceived that the rich were afraid of them, l therefore disposed to deal harshly with them. Shortly er came an election of municipal officers and members of the te legislature. The contest, as is the custom in America, ught into life a number of clubs and other organizations, porting to represent various parties or sections of a party, l among others a body calling itself the "Working men's de and Labour Union," the secretary of which was a certain nis Kearney.[1] When the election was over, Kearney declared t he would keep his union going, and form a working man's ty. He was Irish by birth, and though in business as a yman, had some experience as a sailor, and held a master's tificate. He had borne a good character for industry and adiness till some friend "put him into stocks," and the loss of at he hoped to gain is said to have first turned him to agita- n. He had gained some faculty in speaking by practice at a nday debating club called the Lyceum of Self Culture. A f-cultivating lyceum sounds as harmless as a Social Science gress, but there are times when even mutual improvement ieties may be dangerous. Kearney's tongue, loud and vio- t, soon gathered an audience. On the west side of San Fran- co, as you cross the peninsula from the harbour towards the an, there was then a large open space, laid out for building,

[1] See note in the Appendix at the end of this volume.

but not yet built on, covered with sand, and hence called th
Sand Lot. Here the mob had been wont to gather for meeting
here Kearney formed his party. At first he had mostly vag
bonds to listen, but one of the two great newspapers took hi
up. These two, the *Chronicle* and the *Morning Call*, were
keen rivalry, and the former, seeing in this new moveme
a chance of going ahead, filling its columns with sensation
matter, and increasing its sale among working men, went
hot and strong for the Sand Lot party. One of its reporte
has been credited with dressing up Kearney's speeches in
something approaching literary form, for the orator was
imperfectly educated man, with ideas chiefly gathered from th
daily press. The advertisement which the *Chronicle* gave hi
by its reports and articles, and which he repaid by advisi
working men to take it, soon made him a personage; and h
position was finally assured by his being, along with sever
other speakers, arrested and prosecuted on a charge of ri
in respect of inflammatory speeches delivered at a meeting
the top of Nob Hill, one of the steep heights which make S
Francisco the most picturesque of American cities. The pro
ecution failed, and Kearney was a popular hero. Clerks a
the better class of citizens now began to attend his meetin
though many went from mere curiosity, as they would ha
gone to a circus: the W. P. C. (Workingman's Party of Ca
fornia) was organized as a regular party, embracing the wh
State of California, with Kearney for its president. The gath
ing on the Sand Lot to which all those "eager for new thing
as the discontented class were of old time called, flocked eve
Sunday afternoon to cheer denunciations of corporations a
monopolists, and to "resolute" against the rich general
became a centre of San Francisco politics, and through t
reports of some newspapers and the attacks of others, rous
the people of the entire State. The *Morning Call* had n
followed the lead of the *Chronicle*, trying to outbid it for t
support of the working men. There was nothing positi
nothing constructive or practical, either in these tirades or
the programme of the party, but an open-air crowd is
critical, and gives the loudest cheers to the strongest l
guage. Kearney was not without shrewdness and addre
he knew how to push himself to the front, and retain

utation of rugged honesty: he always dressed as a work-
n and ran for no office, and while denouncing politicians
thieves and capitalists as blood-suckers, while threaten-
fire and the halter if the demands of the people were
granted, he tried to avoid direct breaches of the law.
one occasion he held a gathering beside the mansions
the Central Pacific magnates on Nob Hill, pointed to
m and to the bonfire which marked the place of meeting,
while telling the people that these men deserved to have
ir houses burned, abstained from suggesting that the torch
uld be applied then and there. Another time he bade the
ple wait a little till his party had carried their candidate
the governorship of the State: "Then we shall have the
trol of the militia and the armouries; then we can go down
he Pacific Mail Company's dock and turn back the steamers
t come in bringing the Chinese."[1] Immense enthusiasm
evoked by these harangues. He was crowned with flowers;
vas, when released from prison on one occasion, drawn in
mph by his followers in his own dray; newspaper reporters
nged around to interview him; prominent politicians came
eek favours from him on the sly. Discontent among the
king class was the chief cause that made the new party
v, for grow it did: and though San Francisco was the centre
s strength, it had clubs in Sacramento and the other cities,
ed by the San Francisco convention which Kearney swayed.
there were further causes not to be passed over. One was
distrust of the officials of the State and the city. The
icipal government of San Francisco was far from pure.
officials enriched themselves, while the paving, the drain-
the lighting were scandalously neglected; corruption and
tical jobbery had found their way even into school man-
nent, and liquor was sold everywhere, the publicans being
ued with the heads of the police to prevent the enforce-
t of the laws. Another was the support given to their
ntryman by the Irish, here a discontented and turbulent
of the population, by the lower class of German immi-
ts, and by the longshore men, also an important element

n an earlier agitation this company's yard was attacked, but the only
n killed was a lad (one of the special constables defending it) whose gun

in this great port, and a dangerous element (as long ago i
Athens) wherever one finds them. The activity of the *Chron*
icle counted for much, for it was ably written, went every
where, and continued to give a point and force to Kearney'
harangues, which made them not less effective in print tha
even his voice had made them to the listening crowds. Som
think that the monied classes at this juncture ought to hav
bought up the *Chronicle* (supposing they could have done s
secretly), and its then editor and proprietor has been muc
maligned if he would have refused to be bought up.[1] Th
newspapers certainly played a great part in the movement
they turned the Working man's party into a force by repr
senting it to have already become one. Most important o
all, however, was the popular hatred of the Chinese. Thi
is so strong in California that any party which can becom
its exponent rides on the crest of the wave. The old pa
ties, though both denouncing Chinese immigration in ever
convention they held, and professing to legislate against i
had failed to check it by State laws, and had not yet obtaine
Federal laws prohibiting it. They had therefore lost the co
fidence of the masses on this point, while the Sand Lot part
whose leaders had got into trouble for the ferocity of the
attacks on the Chinese, gained that confidence, and becam
the "anti-Mongolian" party *par excellence*. Like Cato wit
his *Delenda est Carthago*, Kearney ended every speech wit
the words, "And whatever happens, the Chinese must go."

Meanwhile, where were the old parties, and what was the
attitude to this new one? It is so hard in America to esta
lish a new movement outside the regular party lines, that wh
such a movement is found powerful, we may expect to fi
that there exist special causes weakening these lines. Su
forces existed in California. She lies so far from the Atlant
and Mississippi States, and has been so much occupied wi

[1] This editor became subsequently famous over America by his "difficultie
with a leading Baptist minister of San Francisco. He had shot this minis
in the street from behind the blind of a carriage, and thereby made him
popular that the W. P. C. carried him for their candidate for the mayoral
The blood feud, however, was not settled by this unintended service, for
clergyman's son went soon after to the *Chronicle* office and slew the edi
The young man was tried, and, of course, acquitted. He had only done w
the customary law of primitive peoples requires. It survives in Albania,
is scarcely extinct in Corsica.

r own concerns — even the War of Secession did not interest
r as it did the country east of the Rocky Mountains — that
e two great national parties have had a comparatively weak
ld on the people. The Chinese question and the railroad
estion dwarfed the regular party issues. Neither party had
own itself able to deal with the former — both parties were
pected of having been tampered with on the latter. Both
l incurred the discredit which follows every party in hard
es, when the public are poor, and see that their taxes have
n ill-spent. The Sand Lot party drew its support chiefly
m the Democrats, who here, as in the East, have the larger
re of the rabble: hence its rise was not unwelcome to the
publicans, because it promised to divide and weaken their
opponents; while the Democrats, hoping ultimately to cap-
e it, gave a feeble resistance. Thus it grew the faster, and
n began to run a ticket of its own at city and State elections.
carried most of the city offices, and when the question was
mitted to the people whether a new Constitution should be
med for California, it threw its vote in favour of having one,
l prevailed.

"The hoodlums"[1] and other ragamuffins who had formed
audience at the first Sand Lot meetings could not have
cted this. But the W. P. C. now got a heavy vote in San
ncisco from the better sort of working men, clerks, and
ll shopkeepers. In the rural districts they had still more
erful allies. The so-called Granger movement had spread
n the upper Mississippi States into California, and enlisted
farmers in a campaign against the railroads and other
onopolists" and corporations. To compel a reduction of
rges for goods and passengers, to prevent the railroad from
bining with the Panama Steamship Company, to reduce
lic expenditure, to shift more taxation on to the shoulders
he rich, and generally to "cinch" capital — these were the
s of the Granger party; nor will any one who knows Cali-
ia think them wholly unreasonable. The only way to
ct them was by a new Constitution, not only because some
ld not have been attained under the then existing Consti-

[1] The term "hoodlums" denotes those who are called in Australia, "larrikins," and in Liverpool, "corner-boys," loafing youths of mischievous activities.

tution (passed in 1849 and amended in several points subs
quently), but also because the people have more direct contr
over legislation through a convention making a Constitutio
than they have over the action of a legislature. The delegat
to a convention go straight from the election to their wor
have not time to forget, or to devise means of evading, the
pledges, are less liable to be "got at" by capitalists. The
constitute only one house, whereas the legislature has tw
There is no governor to stand in the way with his veto. Th
rarity and importance of the occasion fixes public attentio
Thus a new Constitution became the object of the popular er
and a heavy vote in favour of having it was cast by the count
farmers as well as by decent working-people in the towns, ju
because it promised a new departure and seemed to get behi
the old parties. As often happens, the "good citizens," wh
ought to have seen the danger of framing a new Constitutio
at a time of such excitement, were apathetic and unorganize

Next came, in the summer of 1878, the choice of delegat
to the convention which was to frame the new Constitutio
The Working man's party carried many seats in the conve
tion, but its nominees were mostly ignorant men, witho
experience or constructive ideas.[1] Among the lawyers, wh
secured a large representation, there were some closely bou
by business ties to the great corporations and therefore d
posed to protect the interests of these corporations, as well
those of the legal profession. In justice to many of them
must be added that their respect for the principles of the co
mon law and for sound constitutional doctrine made them
their best to restrain the wild folly of their colleagues. Ho
ever, the working men's delegates, together with the mo
numerous and less corruptible delegates of the farmers, g
their way in many things and produced that surprising inst
ment by which California is now governed.

[1] Anecdotes were still current three years afterwards of the ignorance
some of the delegates. When the clause prohibiting any "law impairing
obligation of contracts" (taken from the Federal Constitution) was un
discussion, a San Francisco delegate objected to it. An eminent lawyer, lea
of the Californian bar, who recognized in the objector a little upholsterer
used to do jobs about his house, asked why. The upholsterer replied, t
he disapproved altogether of contracts, because he thought work should
done by hiring workmen for the day.

III. The New Constitution

An able Californian writer gives the following account of the nstitution of 1879: —

"The new Constitution adopted in May, 1879, made radical changes in nost every department of the Government. It completely changed the icial system, and thereby rendered necessary an alteration of almost the laws relating to civil and criminal procedure. It revolutionized working, and to a great extent the scope of the legislative department, ping off special and local legislation, and obliging the objects hereto- e obtained by such legislation to be covered by general law. As a part this revolution, it required a new plan of county, township, and city anization, with the idea partly of forcing the same general laws upon local governments, and partly of investing such local governments with ver to legislate for themselves. But the main underlying spirit of the v instrument was an attack upon capital under the specious name of osition to monopolies. To use an expressive Californian phrase, capi- and especially accumulated capital, wherever it was found, was to be nched.'[1] With this object in view, cheap labour was to be driven out the country, and corporations so restricted and hampered in their rations as to be unable to make large profits. The cry was that there re unjust discriminations on the part of the railroads, and extortionate es on the part of water and gas companies; that vicious practices were ulged in by mining corporations; that fair day's wages for fair day's our could not be obtained; that rich men rolled in luxury, and that r men were cramped with want. It may be admitted that there were ne grounds for these complaints. But it does not follow that capital s any more tyrannical or corporations are more unconscionable than their very nature they are compelled to be."[2]

Some of the above points, and particularly the changes in al government and in the judicial system, lie rather outside e scope of the present narrative, and I therefore confine my- f to inquiring how far the objects aimed at by the Sand Lot ty were attained through the Constitution whose enactment had secured. They and the Grangers, or farmers' party, ich made common cause with them, sought to deal with four estions in which lay the grievances chiefly complained of by contented Californians.

ese were —

The general corruption of politicians, and bad conduct of State, county, and city government.

[1] "Cinching" is drawing tight the girths of a horse.

[2] Mr. Theodore H. Hittell in the *Berkeley Quarterly* for July, 1880.

Taxation, alleged to press too heavily on the poorer classe
The tyranny of corporations, especially railroads.
The Chinese.

Let us see what remedies the Constitution applied to each
these. The cry of the Sand Lot party had been: "None b
honest men for the offices." To find the honest men, an
having found them, to put them in office and keep them ther
is the great problem of American politics. The contributio
made to its solution by the Convention of 1879 were neith
novel nor promising. I have noted at the end of this chapt
a few of some of its more important provisions, and some se
tions of the Constitution itself will be found printed in full
the end of the preceding volume. Here I will merely sum u
its main results under the four heads above-mentioned.[1]

1. It restricts and limits in every possible way the powe
of the State legislature, leaving it little authority e
cept to carry out by statutes the provisions of the Co
stitution. It makes "lobbying," *i.e.* the attempt
corrupt a legislator, and the corrupt action of a leg
lator, felony.
2. It forbids the State legislature or local authorities
incur debts beyond a certain limit, taxes uncultivat
land equally with cultivated, makes sums due
mortgage taxable in the district where the mortgag
property lies, authorizes an income tax, and directs
highly inquisitorial scrutiny of everybody's proper
for the purposes of taxation.
3. It forbids the "watering of stock," declares that t
State has power to prevent corporations from condu
ing their business so as to "infringe the general we
being of the State"; directs the charges of telegra
and gas companies, and of water-supplying bodies,
be regulated and limited by law; institutes a railro
commission with power to fix the transportation rat
on all railroads and examine the books and accou
of all transportation companies.

[1] As to the nature of State constitutions in general, and the restrictions th
now impose on legislatures, see Chapters XXXVII. *sqq.* in Vol. I.

4. It forbids all corporations to employ any Chinese, debars them from the suffrage (thereby attempting to transgress the fifteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, forbids their employment on any public works, annuls all contracts for "coolie labour," directs the legislature to provide for the punishment of any company which shall import Chinese, to impose conditions on the residence of Chinese, and to cause their removal if they fail to observe these conditions.

It also declares that eight hours shall constitute a legal day's ork on all public works.[1]

When the Constitution came to be submitted to the vote of e people, in May, 1879, it was vehemently opposed by the onied men, who of course influence, in respect to their wealth, ar larger number of votes than they themselves cast. Several the conservative delegates had, I was told, abstained from tting forth their full efforts to have the worst proposals jected by the convention in the belief that when the people me to consider them, they would ensure the rejection of the ole instrument. Some of its provisions were alleged to be posed to the Constitution of the United States, and therefore ll. Others were denounced as ruinous to commerce and dustry, calculated to drive capital out of the country. The uggle was severe, but the Granger party commanded so many al votes, and the Sand Lot party so many in San Francisco hose population was then nearly a third of that of the en- e State), that the Constitution was carried, though by a all majority, only 11,000, out of a total of 145,000 citizens ing. Of course it had to be enacted as a whole, amendment ng impossible where a vote of the people is taken.

The next thing was to choose a legislature to carry out the nstitution. Had the same influences prevailed in this election prevailed in that of the Constitutional Convention, the results ght have been serious. But, fortunately, there was a slight ction, now that the first and main step seemed to have been ten. The Republicans, Democrats, and Sand Lot party all "tickets," and owing to this division of the working men's l the Granger vote between Kearneyite candidates and the

[1] For some further remarks on the new Constitution see note in Appendix.

Democrats, the Republicans secured a majority, though a sma one. Now the Republicans are in California, as they woul themselves say, the moderate and conservative party, or as the opponents said, the party of the rich and the monopolist Their predominance made the legislature of 1880 a body mo cautious than might have been expected. Professing heart loyalty to the new Constitution, the majority showed th loyalty by keeping well within the letter of that instrumen while the working men and farmer members were disposed t follow out by bold legislation what they called its spirit. Thu the friends and the enemies of the Constitution changed place Those who had opposed it in the Convention posed as its ad mirers and defenders; while those who had clamoured for an carried it now began to wish that they had made its directio more imperative. The influence and the money of the railroa and the other great corporations were of course brought in play, despite the terrors of a prosecution for felony, and becam an additional "conservative force" of great moment.

Thus a series of statutes was passed which gave effect to th provisions of the Constitution in a form perhaps as little harm ful as could be contrived, and certainly less harmful than ha been feared when the Constitution was put to the vote. Mar bad bills, particularly those aimed at the Chinese, were d feated, and one may say generally that the expectations of th Sand Lot men were grievously disappointed.

While all this was passing, Kearney had more and mo declined in fame and power. He did not sit either in the Co stitutional Convention or in the legislature of 1880. The mo had tired of his harangues, especially as little seemed to com of them, and as the candidates of the W. P. C. had behave no better in office than those of the old parties. He ha quarrelled with the *Chronicle*. He was, moreover, unfitt by knowledge or training to argue the legal, economical, an political questions involved in the new Constitution, so that t prominence of these questions threw him into the backgrou An anti-Chinese agitation, in which the unemployed march about San Francisco, calling on employers to discharge Chinese workmen, caused some alarm in the winter of 1879–8 but Kearney was absent at the time, and when he return his party was wavering. Even his prosecution and impriso

ent on a rather trivial charge gave only a brief revival to s popularity. The W. P. C. was defeated in a city election March, 1880, by a combination of the better class of Demo- ats with the Republicans, and soon after expired.

When I was in San Francisco in the fall of 1881, people lked of Kearney as a spent rocket. Some did not know nether he was in the city. Others said that the capitalists had ndered him harmless by the gift of a new dray and team. ot long afterwards he went East, and mounted the stump on half of the Labour party in New York. He proved, how- er, scarcely equal to his fame, for mob oratory is a flower nich does not always bear transplantation. Since 1880 he s from time to time taken some part, but never a conspic- us part, in Californian politics, and was, indeed, in 1883, no nger deemed a force to be regarded. And now, as the elandic sagas say, he is out of the story.

After the session of 1880, Californian politics resumed their l features. Election frauds are said to have become less equent since glass ballot boxes were adopted, whereby the actice of stuffing a box with papers before the voters ar- re in the morning has been checked. But the game between e two old parties goes on as before. What remained of the nd Lot group was reabsorbed into the Democratic party, out which it had mainly come, and to which it had strong affin- es. The city government of San Francisco is much what it s before the agitation, — a few years ago, under Boss Buck- , it was even worse, — nor does the legislature seem to be y purer or wiser. When the railroad commission had to be ected, the railroad magnates managed so to influence the ction, although it was made directly by the people, that two the three commissioners chosen were, or soon afterwards me, under their influence, while the third was a mere de- imer. None of them possessed the practical knowledge of lway business needed to enable them to deal, in the manner ntemplated by the Constitution, with the oppressions alleged be practised by the railroads; and the complaints of those pressions seemed in 1883 to be as common as formerly. I quired in that year why the railroad magnates had not been ntent to rely on certain provisions of the Federal Constitu- n against the control sought to be exerted over their under-

taking. The answer was that they had considered this course but had concluded that it was cheaper to capture a majority of the Commission. The passing of the Inter-State Commerce Act by Congress was expected to bring about a change in the situation, but that act has disappointed its promoters; and the tyranny of the Southern Pacific Railroad (as it is now called though it controls the Central Pacific line also) remains severe In July 1894, when the dispute between the Pullman Company and their employés in Illinois gave rise to a railway strike over large parts of the West, the mobs which attacked the depots and wrecked the trains in California seem to have been regarded by the mass of the people with a sympathy which can be attributed to nothing but the general hostility felt to the railroad company which has so long lain like an incubus on the State.

Some of the legislation framed under the Constitution of 187 has already been pronounced by the Supreme Court of the State invalid, as opposed to that instrument itself or to the Federal Constitution, and more of it may share the same fate. The condition of the people at large has not substantially changed though the restrictions imposed on the legislature (as regards special legislation) and on local authorities (as regards borrowing and the undertaking of costly public works) have proved beneficial. The net result of the whole agitation was to give the monied classes in California a fright; to win for the State a bad name throughout America, and, by checking for a time the influx of capital, to retard her growth just when prosperity was reviving over the rest of the country; to worry without seriously crippling, the great corporations, and to leave the working classes and farmers where they were. No great harm has been done, and the Constitution, pruned and trimmed by the courts, is now (1893) reported to be working fairly well. Nevertheless, a mischievous example has been set, and an instrument remains in force which may some day be made the basis of further attacks upon the capitalist class.

IV. Observations on the Movement

I would leave the reader to draw a moral for himself, were he not likely to err, as I did myself, till corrected by my

alifornian friends, by thinking the whole movement more erious than it really was.

It rose with surprising ease and swiftness. The conditions ere no doubt exceptionally favourable. No other population in merica furnished so good a field for demagogy. But the demaogue himself was not formidable. He did not make the movement, but merely rode for a moment on the crest of the wave. uropeans may say that a stronger man, a man with knowdge, education, and a fierce tenacity of fibre, might have uilt up a more permanent power, and used it with more estructive effect. But Californians say that a strong man ould not have been suffered to do what Kearney did with mpunity. Kearney throve — so they allege — because the olid classes despised him, and felt that the best thing was to t him talk himself out and reveal his own hollowness.

The movement fell as quickly as it rose. This was partly ue, as has just been said, to the incompetence of the leader, ho had really nothing to propose and did not know how to se the force that seemed to have come to his hands. Someing, however, must be set down to the credit of the American arty system. The existing parties are so strong, and are pread over so wide an area, that it is very difficult to create new party. Resting on a complex local organization, and upported by the central organization for the purposes of Fedal politics, they can survive a temporary eclipse in a particar State, while a new party cannot count itself permanent ll it has established some such organization, central as well local. This may operate badly in keeping old parties alive, hen they deserve to die. But it operates well in checking e growth or abridging the life of mischievous local factions. hat fund of good sense, moreover, which lies at the bottom nearly every native American mind, soon produces a reaction gainst extreme measures. When the native voters, especially ose who owned even a little property, had relieved their inds by voting for the new Constitution, they felt they had ne far enough in the direction of change, and at the election a legislature voted for moderate men. Support from this ass having been withdrawn, the Sand Lot rabble ceased to be ngerous; and although threats of violence were abundant, d sometimes bloodthirsty, there was little sedition or disorder.

Every stump orator in the West says a great deal more than he means, and is promptly discounted by his hearers. The populace of San Francisco has now and again menaced the Chinese quarter and the docks of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, which, until recent legislation by Congress checked them, brought the Chinese over. Once the Chinese armed in defence of Chinatown, and twice during these agitations a committee of public safety was formed to protect the banks and keep order in the streets. But many people doubt whether order was really endangered. The few attacks made on Chinese stores were done by small bands of hoodlums, who disappeared at the sight of the police. The police and militia seem to have behaved well all through. Moreover, any serious riot would in San Francisco be quelled speedily and severely by the respectable classes, who would supersede the municipal authority if it seemed to fear, or to be secretly leagued with the authors of sedition. Even the meetings of the various political parties were scarcely ever disturbed or "bull-dozed" by their opponents. When the Kearneyites once or twice molested Democratic meetings, they were so promptly repelled, that they desisted for the future.

There was very little of conscious or constructive communism or socialism in the movement. Kearney told the working men that the rich had thriven at their expense, and talked of hanging thieves in office, and burning the houses of capitalists. But neither he nor any other demagogue assailed the institution of property. The farmers, whose vote carried the new Constitution, owned their farms, and would have recoiled from suggestions of agrarian socialism. And in fact the new Constitution, although it contains provisions hostile to capital "is anything but agrarian or communistic, for it entrenches vested rights, especially in land, more thoroughly than before . . . It is anything but a working man's Constitution; it levies a poll tax without exemption; disfranchises a considerable portion of the floating labour vote; prevents the opening of public works in emergencies, and in various ways which working men, even in their present stage of enlightenment may easily see, sacrifices the interests of the labouring classes as well as the capitalists, to what the landowners regard as

heir interests."[1] A solitary Parisian communist who was lected to the convention "exercised no influence, and was xpelled from the party for refusing to support the new Con- titution." There were some rich men, and lawyers connected ith the great corporations, among the candidates and sup- orters of the Sand Lot party. Others of the same class who ried secretly to use it had probably their selfish ends to serve, ut would have been less willing to increase its strength had ney regarded it as an attack on property in general. The fact that theoretical communism has no hold upon native Ameri- ans, while its practical application does not commend itself to armers who own their land and workmen who own their houses. he belief which prevailed in the Eastern States that the move- ent had a communistic character was therefore a mistaken one.

More mischief would have been done but for the existence f the Federal Constitution. It imposed a certain check on ne Convention, who felt the absurdity of trying to legislate ght in the teeth of an overruling instrument. It has been ne means of upsetting some of the clauses of the Constitution f 1879, and some of the statutes passed by the legislature nder them, and has discouraged attempts to pass others.

On the whole, not much evil has been wrought, at least not uch compared with what was feared in the State itself, and elieved in the East to have resulted. The better sort of Cali- ornians two years after were no longer alarmed, but seemed alf ashamed and half amused when they recollected the scenes have described. They felt somewhat as a man feels when he wakes unrefreshed after a night of bad dreams. He fears at rst that his parched tongue and throbbing head may mean at he has caught a fever. But when he has breakfasted and again immersed in work, these sensations and apprehensions isappear together. After all, say the lawyers and bankers of an Francisco, we are going on as before, property will take are of itself in this country, things are not really worse so far s our business is concerned.

Neither are things better. It is natural to suppose that a ock, however short, must make a difference to a community, nd affect its future fortunes. If this shock has so affected

[1] Mr. H. George, in *Popular Science Monthly* for August, 1880.

California, the results are not yet apparent. Though the new Constitution has not altered the economic condition of the workmen and farmers, it might have been thought that the crisis, which suddenly startled this busy and (in San Francisco) luxurious society, would rouse good citizens to a more active interest in politics, make them see the necessity of getting honester men into the offices and the legislature, and, indeed, of purifying public life altogether. But these consequences do not seem to have followed. In the stress and hurry of Californian life, impressions pass swiftly away. Good citizens are disposed to stand aside; and among the richer many look forward to a time when, having made their fortunes, they will go East to spend them. San Francisco in particular continues to be deplorably misgoverned, and passes from the tyranny of one Ring to that of another, with no change save in the persons of those who prey upon her. It may be that another shock is in store for the Golden State, more violent than the last, although equally within legal limits, for there seems no danger, in spite of such outbreaks as marked the great railway strikes of 1894, of mere mob law and anarchy. The forces at the disposal of order are always the stronger, nor are the Californians, with all their restlessness, specially inclined to communistic experiments. It may on the other hand be that as society settles down from the feverish instability of these early days, as the mass of the people acquire a more enlightened view of their true interests, as those moral influences which count for so much in America assert their dominion more widely, the present evils will slowly pass away. The president of the Vigilance Committee of 1856 told me that all he had seen happen in San Francisco, since the days when it was a tiny Spanish mission, made him confident that everything would come out straight. Probably he is right. American experience shows that the optimists generally are.

Epilogue to this and the Two Last Preceding Chapters.

The illustrations given in these three chapters of perversion of popular government carry their moral with them, and only a few parting comments are needed.

Neither of the two great political parties has in respect of
he events narrated a better record than its rival. If the
ammany Ring sheds little lustre upon the Democrats of New
ork, the Gas Ring of Philadelphia is no more creditable to
he Republicans of Pennsylvania.

Both in New York and in Philadelphia there was nothing
uly political in the character and career of the Rings. Tam-
any has been for thirty years a selfish combination of men
ho have had purely personal ends to serve; and Tweed in
rticular was a mere vulgar robber. So the Gas Ring strove
d throve, and its successors have striven and thriven, solely
secure patronage and gain to their respective members.
ue indeed it is that neither in New York nor in Philadelphia
uld the Rings have won their way to power without the
nnivance of chiefs among the national parties, who needed
e help of the vote the Rings controlled; true also that that
te would never have become so large had not many citizens
oked on the Rings as the "regular" organizations, and heirs
the local party traditions. But neither Ring had ever any
stinctive principles or proposals: neither ever appealed to
e people on behalf of a doctrine or a scheme calculated
benefit the masses. Lucre, with office as a means to lucre,
s their only aim, the party for the sake of the party their
ly watchword.

What, then, are the salient features of these two cases, and
at the lessons they enforce? They are these. The power
an organization in a multitude; the facility with which the
ministrative machinery of government may be made the
strument of private gain; the disposition of the average
spectable citizen to submit to bad government rather than
ke the trouble of overthrowing it. These are not wholly
w phenomena, but they are hardly such as would have been
oked for in the United States; and not one of them was
ared when Tocqueville wrote.

Very different, and far less discreditable to those concerned,
the case of California. The movement which gave birth to
e new Constitution was a legitimate political movement. It
s crude in its aims, and tainted with demagogism in its
ethods. But it was evoked by real evils; and it sought,
wever ignorantly, the public good. Kearney had no sordid

personal ends to serve, and gained for himself nothing mor solid than notoriety. His agitation was essentially the sam as that which has appeared in the Western States under th forms of Grangerism, the Farmers' Alliance, and Populism an effort to apply political remedies to evils, real or supposed which are mainly economic rather than political, and only part of which legislation can remove. Similar movement must from time to time be expected; all that can be hoped i to keep them within constitutional lines, and prevent ther from damaging the credit and retarding the prosperity of th States they affect. Nothing is more natural than that thos who suffer from hard times and see that a few men grow ric while the vast majority remain poor should confound th mischiefs which arise from State or city maladministratio and from the undue power which the laws have permitte corporations to acquire with other hardships due to the consti tution of human nature and the conditions of the world w live in, and should, possessing the whole power of the State strike out wildly at all three at once. In a country so littl restrained by ancient traditions or deference to the educate class as is Western America, a country where the aptitude fo politics is so much in advance of economic wisdom, it is les surprising that these storms should sometimes darken the sk than that they should uproot so little in their course.

CHAPTER XCI

THE HOME OF THE NATION

There are three points wherein the territories which constitute the United States present phenomena new in the annals of the world. They contain a huge people whose blood is becoming mixed in an unprecedented degree by the concurrent immigration of numerous European races. We find in them, beside the predominant white nation, seven millions of men belonging to a dark race, thousands of years behind in its intel ctual development, but legally equal in political and civil ghts. And thirdly, they furnish an instance to which no paral- l can be found of a vast area, including regions very dissimilar their natural features, occupied by a population nearly the hole of which speaks the same tongue, and all of which lives der the same institutions. Of these phenomena the first has en already frequently referred to, while the second is dealt th in a later chapter. The third suggests to us thoughts d questions which cannot pass unnoticed. No one can travel the United States without asking himself whether this im- ense territory will remain united or be split up into a number independent communities; whether, even if it remain united, verse types of life and character will spring up within it; nether and how far climatic and industrial conditions will fect those types, carrying them farther from the prototypes Europe. These questions, as well as other questions regard- g the future local distribution of wealth and population, open lds of inquiry and speculation too wide to be here explored. et some pages may well be given to a rapid survey of the geo- aphical conditions of the United States, and of the influence ose conditions have exerted and may, so far as can be fore- en, continue to exert on the growth of the nation, its political l economical development. Beginning with a few observa-

tions first on the orography of the country and then upon its meteorology, we may consider how mountain ranges and climate have hitherto affected the movement of colonization and the main stream of political history. The chief natural sources of wealth may next be mentioned, and their possible effect indicated upon the development of population in particular areas, as well as upon the preservation of the permanent unity of the Republic.

One preliminary remark must not be omitted. The relation of geographical conditions to national growth changes, and with the upward progress of humanity the ways in which Nature moulds the fortunes of man are always varying. Man must in every stage be for many purposes dependent upon the circumstances of his physical environment. Yet the character of that dependence changes with his advance in civilization. At first he is helpless, and, therefore, passive. With what Nature gives in the way of food, clothing, and lodging he must be content. She is strong, he is weak: so she dictates his whole mode of life. Presently, always by slow degrees but most quickly in those countries where she neither gives lavishly nor yet presses on him with a discouraging severity, he begins to learn how to make her obey him, drawing from her stores materials which his skill handles in such wise as to make him more and more independent of her. He defies the rigours of climate; he overcomes the obstacles which mountains, rivers and forests place in the way of communications; he discovers the secrets of the physical forces and makes them his servants in the work of production. But the very multiplication of the means at his disposal for profiting by what Nature supplies brings him into ever closer and more complex relations with her. The variety of her resources, differing in different regions, prescribes the kind of industry for which each spot is fitted; and the competition of nations, growing always keener, forces each to maintain itself in the struggle by using to the utmost every facility for production or for the transportation of products. Thus certain physical conditions, whether of soil or of climate, of accessibility or inaccessibility, or perhaps of such available natural forces as water-power, conditions of supreme importance in the earlier stages of man's progress, are now of less relative moment, while others, formerly of small

ccount, have received their full significance by our swiftly dvancing knowledge of the secrets of Nature and mastery of ier forces. It is this which makes the examination of the nfluence of physical environment on the progress of nations o intricate a matter; for while the environment remains, as a vhole, constant, its several parts vary in their importance from ne age to another.[1] A certain severity of climate, for instance, vhich retarded the progress of savage man, has been found elpful to semi-civilized man, in stimulating him to exertion, nd in maintaining a racial vigour greater than that of the nhabitants of those hotter regions where civilization first rose. And thus in considering how man's lot and fate in he Western Continent have been affected by the circumtances of that continent, we must have regard not only to vhat he found on his arrival there, but to the resources which ave been subsequently disclosed. Nor can this latter head be xhausted, because it is impossible to conjecture what still atent forces or capacities may be revealed in the onward march f science, and how such a revelation may affect the value of ne resources now known to exist or hereafter to be explored. It is only on a very few salient points of this large and omplex subject that I shall touch in sketching the outlines f North American geography and noting some of the effects n the growth of the nation attributable to them.

The territory of the United States extends nearly 3000 miles ast and west from the Bay of Fundy to the mouth of the Columia River, and 1400 miles north and south from the Lake of the Voods to the Gulf of Mexico at Galveston. Compared with urope, the physical structure of this area of 3,025,000 square iles[2] (excluding Alaska) is not only larger in scale, but far

[1] Navigable rivers, for instance, were at one time the main channels of mmerce, so that towns were founded and prospered in respect of the advanges they gave. The extension of railways diminished their importance, d many great cities now owe their growth to their having become centres here trunk lines meet. Should a means be discovered of cheaply obtaining d transmitting electric force drawn from flowing water, rivers may regain eir commercial value.

[2] The area of China, the country with which the United States is most fit be compared, since India and the Russian Empire are inhabited by many dirse races, speaking wholly diverse tongues, is estimated at 1,336,000 square les; and the population, the estimates of which range from 280,000,000 to 0,000,000, may possibly be, in A.D. 2000, equalled by that of the United States.

simpler. Instead of the numerous peninsulas and islands of Europe, with the bold and lofty chains dividing its peoples from one another, we find no isles (except Long Island) of any size on the two coasts of the United States, only one large peninsula (that of Florida), and only two mountain systems. Not only the lakes and rivers, but the plains also, and the mountain ranges, are of enormous dimensions. The coast presents a smooth outline. No great inlets, such as the Mediterranean and the Baltic, pierce the land and cut off one district from another, furnishing natural boundaries behind which distinct nations may grow up.

This vast area may be divided into four regions — two of level country, two, speaking roughly, of mountain. Beginning from the Atlantic, we find a strip which on the coast is nearly level, and then rises gradually westwards into an undulating country. It varies in breadth from thirty or forty miles in the north to two hundred and fifty in the south, and has been called by geographers the Atlantic Plain and Slope. Behind this strip comes a range, or rather a mass of generally parallel ranges, of mountains. These are the Alleghanies, or so-called "Appalachian system," in breadth from one hundred to two hundred miles, and with an average elevation of from two to four thousand feet, some few summits reaching six thousand. Beyond them, still further to the west, lies the vast basin of the Mississippi and its tributaries, 1100 miles wide and 1200 miles long. Its central part is an almost unbroken plain for hundreds of miles on each side the river, but this plain rises slowly westward in rolling undulations into a sort of plateau which, at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, has attained the height of 5000 feet above the sea. The fourth region consists of the thousand miles that lie between the Mississippi basin and the Pacific. It includes three not entirely disconnected mountain ranges, the Rockies, the Sierra Nevada (continued northwards in the Cascade Range), and the much lower and narrower Coast Range, which runs along the shore of the ocean. This region is generally mountainous, though within it there are some extensive plateaux and some wide valleys. Most of it is from 4000 to 8000 feet above the sea, with many summits exceeding 14,000, though none reaches 15,000. A considerable part of it, including the desert of Nevada, does not drain into the ocean, but sees its feeble streams received by lakes or swallowed up in the ground.

Before we consider how these natural divisions have influ-
nced, and must continue to influence, American history, it
s well to observe how materially they have affected the
limate of the continent, which is itself a factor of prime
istorical importance. Two points deserve special notice. One
s the great extent of temperate area which the continent
resents. As North America is crossed by no mountain chains
unning east and west, corresponding to the Alps and Pyrenees
n Europe, or to the Caucasus, Himalaya and Altai in Asia,
he cold winds of the north sweep down unchecked over the
ast Mississippi plain, and give its central and southern parts,
own to the Gulf of Mexico, winters cooler than the latitude
eems to promise, or than one finds in the same latitudes in
Europe. Nor ought the influence of the neighbouring seas to
ass unregarded. Europe has, south of the narrow Mediter-
anean, a vast reservoir of heat in the Sahara: North America
as the wide stretch of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean
ea, with no region both hot and arid beyond. Thus Tennessee
nd Arkansas, in the latitude of Andalusia and Damascus have
winter like that of Edinburgh twenty degrees further to the
orth; and while the summer of Minnesota, in latitude 45°, is
s hot as that of Bordeaux or Venice in the same latitude,
ne winter is far more severe. Only the low lands along the
tlantic coast as far north as Cape Hatteras have a high winter
s well as summer temperature, for they are warmed by the
ot water of the Gulf Stream, just as the extreme north-eastern
ast is chilled by the Polar current which washes it. The
illy country behind these southern Atlantic lowlands — the
estern parts of the two Carolinas, northern Georgia and
labama — belongs to the Appalachian system, and is high
nough to have cool and in parts even severe winters.

The other point relates to the amount of moisture. The first
vo of our four regions enjoy an ample rainfall. So do the
astern and the central parts of the Mississippi basin. When,
owever, we reach the centre of the continent, some four hun-
red miles west of the Mississippi, the air grows dry, and the
anty showers are not sufficient for the needs of agriculture.
is only by the help of irrigation that crops can be raised all
ong the east foot of the Rocky Mountains and in the valleys
f the fourth region, until we cross the Sierra Nevada and

come within two hundred miles of the Pacific. Through great part of this Rocky Mountain region, therefore, stock rearing, or "ranching," as it is called, takes the place of tillage, and in many districts there is not enough moisture even to support grass. Between the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevada there lie vast deserts, the largest that which stretches westward from the Great Salt Lake,[1] a desert of clay and stones rather than of sand, bearing only alkaline plants with low, prickly shrubs, and, apparently, destined to remain, save in some few spots where brooks descend from the mountains,[2] eternally sterile and solitary. Lofty as these environing mountains are, they bear scarce any perpetual snow, and no glaciers at all south of the fortieth parallel of north latitude.[3] The great peaks of Colorado lie little further south than the Pennine Alps, which they almost equal in height, but it is only in nooks and hollows turned away from the sun that snow lasts through the summer, so scanty is the winter snow-fall and so rapidly does evaporation proceed in the dry air. That same general north and south direction of the American mountain ranges, which gives cool winters to the Southern States, cuts off the west-borne rain-clouds from the Pacific, and condemns one half or more of our fourth region to aridity. On the other hand, North-western California, with the western parts of Oregon and Washington, washed by the Japan current, enjoy both a moderate and a humid — in some places very humid — climate, which, along the Pacific coast north of latitude 43°, resembles that of South-western England.

Reserving for the moment a consideration of the wealth-producing capacities of the regions at whose physical structure and climate we have glanced, let us note how that structure and climate have affected the fortunes of the people.

Whoever examines the general lines of a nation's growth, will observe that its development has been guided and governed by three main factors. The first is the pre-existing character and

[1] Similar but smaller deserts occur in Idaho and South-eastern Oregon, and also in the extreme south-west. Part of the desert of Southern California is like part of the Sahara and the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, beneath the level of the ocean.

[2] In Central Colorado, when snow falls, it does not melt but disappears by evaporation, so dry is the air. Sir J. D. Hooker has (in his *Himalayan Journals*) noted the same phenomenon in Tibet.

[3] There is a small glacier on Mount Shasta.

abits of the Race out of which the Nation grows. The second the physical aspect of the land the Nation is placed in, and he third embraces the international concomitants of its formaon, — that is to say, the pressure of other nations upon it, nd the external political circumstances which have controlled s movement, checking it in one direction or making it spread another. The first of these factors may, in the case of the merican people, be assumed as known, for their character nd habits were substantially English.[1] To the second I will eturn presently. The third factor has been in the United tates so unusually simple that one may dismiss it in a few entences. In examining the origin of such nations as the erman or French or Russian or Swiss or Spanish, one must onstantly have regard to the hostile or friendly races or owers which acted on them; and these matters are, for the arlier periods of European history, often obscure. About merica we know everything, and what we know may be consely stated. The territory now covered by the United States as, from a political point of view, practically vacant when scovered in the end of the sixteenth century; for the abogines, though their resistance was obstinate in places, and ough that resistance did much to form the character of the Vestern pioneers, may be left out of account as a historical rce. This territory was settled from three sides, east, south, d west, and by three European peoples. The Spaniards and rench occupied points on the coast of the Gulf. The Spanrds took the shores of the Pacific. The English (reckoning mong the English the cognate Dutchmen and Swedes) planted series of communities along the Atlantic coast. Of these ree independent colonizations, that on the Gulf was feeble, d passed by purchase to the Anglo-Americans in 1803 and 19. That on the Pacific was still more feeble, and also ssed, but by conquest, to the Anglo-Americans in 1848. us the occupation of the country has been from its eastern le alone (save that California received her immigrants by

[1] There were doubtless other influences, especially Dutch; but these (though ecent writer, Mr. Campbell, has ingeniously made the most of them) are, er all, relatively small, not ten per cent, so to speak, of the whole. Far re important than the diverse elements of blood were the conditions of onial, and especially of frontier, life which moulded the young nation, re-ting in the period between 1780 and 1820 many of the phenomena which d accompanied the first settlements of the seventeenth century.

sea between 1847 and 1867), and the march of the peopl has been steadily westward and south-westward. They hav spread where they would. Other powers have scarcely af fected them. Canada, indeed, bounds them on the north, bu they have found no need to overflow into her narrow stri of habitable territory, whence, indeed, a million of people hav come into their wealthier dominions. Like the Spaniards i South America, like the British in Australia, like the Russian in Siberia, the Anglo-Americans have had a free field; and w may pass from the purely political or international factor i the development of the nation to consider how its history ha been affected by those physical conditions which have bee previously noted.

The English in America were, when they began their marc one people, though divided into a number of autonomous com munities; and, to a people already advanced in civilizatio the country was one country, as if destined by nature to retai one and undivided whatever nation might occupy it.

The first settlements were in the region described above a the Atlantic Plain and Slope. No natural boundary, whethe of water or mountain or forest, divided the various commun ties. The frontier line which bounded each colony was a artificial line, — a mere historical accident. So long as the remained near the coast, nature opposed no obstacle to their c operation in war, nor to their free social and commercial inte course in peace. When, however, they had advanced westward as far as the Alleghanies, these mountains barred their pro ress, not so much in the North, where the valley of the Hudso and Mohawk gave an easy path inland, as in Pennsylvani Virginia, and Carolina. The dense, tangled, and often thorn underwood, even more than the high steep ridges, checked th westward movement of population, prevented the settlers fro spreading out widely, as the Spaniards dispersed themselv over Central and South America, and helped, by inducing comparatively dense population, to build up compact commo wealths on the Atlantic coast. So, too, the existence of th rough and, for a long time, almost impassable mountain be tended to cut off those who had crossed it into the weste wilderness from their more polished parent stock, to thro them on their own resources in the struggle with the fier aborigines of Kentucky and Ohio, and to give them that d

inctive character of frontiersmen which was so marked a eature of American history during the first half of this cen- ury, and has left deep traces on the Western men of to-day.

When population began to fill the Mississippi basin the ssential physical unity of the country became more signifi- ant. It suggested to Jefferson, and it led Congress to approve, he purchase of Louisiana from Napoleon, for those who had egun to occupy the valleys of the Ohio and Tennessee rivers elt that they could not afford to be cut off from the sea to hich these highways of commerce led. Once the stream f migration across and around the southern extremity of the lleghanies had begun to flow steadily, the settlers spread out n all directions over the vast plain, like water over a marble oor. The men of the Carolinas and Georgia filled Alabama, Iississippi, and Arkansas; the men of Virginia and Kentucky lled Southern Indiana, Southern Illinois, and Missouri; the nen of New England, New York, and Ohio filled Michigan, Northern Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota. From the ource to the mouth of the Mississippi there was nothing to reak them up or keep them apart. Every Western State, xcept where it takes a river as a convenient boundary, is ounded by straight lines, because every State is an artificial reation. The people were one, and the wide featureless plain as also one. It has been cut into those huge plots we call tates, not because there were physical or racial differences equiring divisions, but merely because political reasons made Federal seem preferable to a unitary system. As the size f the plain showed that the nation would be large, so did ne character of the plain promise that it would remain united. When presently steamers came to ply upon the rivers, each art of the plain was linked more closely to the others; and hen the network of railways spread itself out from the East the Mississippi, the Alleghanies practically disappeared. hey were no longer a barrier to communication. Towns rang up in their valleys; and now the three regions, which ave been described as naturally distinct, the Atlantic Slope, ne Alleghanies, and the Mississippi Basin, have become, conomically and socially as well as politically, one country, hough the dwellers in the wilder parts of the broad mountain elt still lag far behind their neighbours of the eastern and estern lowlands.

When, however, the swelling tide of emigration reached the arid lands at the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains, its course was for a time stayed. This fourth region of mountain and desert, lying between the prairies of the Mississippi affluents and the Pacific Ocean, was, except its coast line, an unknown land till its cession by Mexico in 1846, and the inner and higher parts of it remained unexplored for some twenty years longer. As it was mostly dry and rugged, there was little to tempt settlers into it, for vast tracts of good land remained untouched in the central Mississippi plain. Many years might have passed before it began to fill up, but for the unexpected finding of gold in California. This event at once drew in thousands of settlers; and fresh swarms followed as other mines, principally of silver, began to be discovered in the inland mountain ranges; till at last for the difficult and dangerous wagon track there was substituted a railway, completed in 1867, over mountains and through deserts from the Missouri to the Pacific. Had the Americans of 1850 possessed no more scientific resources than their grandfathers in 1790, the valleys of the Pacific coast, accessible only by sea round Cape Horn, or across the Isthmus of Panama, would have remained isolated from the rest of the country with a tendency to form a character and habits of their own and possibly disposed to aim at political independence. This, however, the telegraph and the railways have prevented. Yet the Rocky Mountains have not, like the Alleghanies, disappeared. The better peopled parts of California, Oregon, and Washington still find that range and the deserts a far more effective barrier than are the lower and narrower ridges on the eastern side of the continent. The fourth region remains a distinct section of the United States, both geographically and to some extent in its social and industrial aspects. All this was to be expected. What need not have happened, and might even have been thought unlikely, was the easy acquisition by the Anglo-Americans of California, Oregon, and Washington regions far removed from the dominions which the Republic already possessed. Had the competition for unappropriated temperate regions been half as keen in 1840 as it is now for tropical Africa (a far less attractive possession) between Germany, France, and Britain, some European power might have pounced upon these territories. They might then have become

nd remained a foreign country to the United States, and have ad few and comparatively slight relations with the Mississ- ppi Basin. It is not nature, but the historical accident which eft them in the hands of a feeble power like Mexico, that has ade them now, and, so far as can be foreseen, for a long uture, members of the great Federation.

In the south-east as well as in the west of the North Ameri- an Continent, climate has been a prime factor in determining ne industrial and political history of the nation. South of ne thirty-fifth parallel of latitude, although the winters are ool enough to be reinvigorative, and to enable a race drawn rom Northern Europe to thrive and multiply,[1] the summers, xcept in the Alleghany highlands, are too hot for such a ace to sustain hard open-air work, or to resist the malaria of ne marshy coast lands. It was for this reason that soon fter the settlement of Virginia, and for nearly two centuries fterwards, natives of the tropics were imported from Africa nd set to till the fields. By their labour large crops of obacco, cotton, rice, and sugar were raised, and large profits ade; so that, while in the North-eastern States slavery pres- ntly died out, and the negroes themselves declined in numbers, ll the wealth and prosperity of the South came to depend pon slave labour, and slavery became intertwined with the ecuniary interests as well as the social habits of the ruling ass. Thus a peculiar form of civilization grew up, so dis- milar from that of the northern half of the country, that not ven the large measure of State independence secured under ne Federal Constitution could enable the two sections to ve together under the same government. Civil war followed, nd for a time it seemed as if the nation were to be perma- ently rent in twain. Physical differences — differences of imate, and of all those industrial and social conditions nat were due to climate — were at the bottom of the strife. et nature herself fought for imperilled unity. Had the eceding States been divided from the Northern States by ny natural barrier, such as a mountain range running from ast to west across the continent, the operations of the invading rmies would have been incomparably more difficult. As it as, the path into the South lay open, and the great south-

[1] New Orleans is in the same latitude as Delhi, whence the children of uropeans have to be sent home in order that they may grow up in health.

flowing rivers of the West helped the invader. Had there not existed, in the Alleghany Mountains, a broad belt of elevated land, thrusting into the revolted territory a wedge of white population which, as it did not own slaves (for in the mountains there were scarce any), did not sympathize with secession, and for the most part actively opposed it, the chances of the Southern Confederates would have been far greater. The Alleghanies interrupted the co-operation of their Eastern and Western armies, and furnished recruits as well as adherents to the North; and it need hardly be added that the climatic conditions of the South made its white population so much smaller, and on the whole so much poorer than that of the North, that exhaustion came far sooner. He who sees the South even to-day, when it has in many places gained vastly since the war, is surprised not that it succumbed but that it was able so long to resist.

With the extinction of slavery, the political unity of the country was secured, and the purpose of nature to make it the domain of a single people might seem to have been fulfilled. Before we inquire whether this result will be a permanent one so far as physical causes are concerned, another set of physical conditions deserves to be considered, those conditions, namely, of earth and sky, which determine the abundance of useful products, that is to say, of wealth, and therethrough, of population also.

The chief natural sources of wealth are fertile soils, mineral deposits, and standing timber.[1] Of these three the last is now practically confined to three districts, — the hills of Maine, the Alleghanies, and the maritime ranges of the Pacific coast, especially in Washington. Elsewhere, though there is a great deal of wooded country, the cutting and exporting of timber, or, as it is called beyond the Atlantic, "lumber," is not (except perhaps in Michigan) an important industry which employs or enriches many persons. It is, moreover, one which constantly declines, for the forests perish daily before fires and the axe far more swiftly than nature can renew them.

As no nation possesses so large an area of land available for

[1] I omit the fisheries, because their commercial importance is confined to three districts, the coasts of Maine and Massachusetts, the rivers of Washington and parts of Alaska, with the seal-bearing Pribyloff Isles. The fisheries of the Pacific coast (Washington, Oregon, and California), are still imperfectly developed.

he sustenance of man, so also none of the greatest nations an boast that out of its whole domain, so large a proportion f land is fit for tillage or for stock-rearing. If we except he stony parts of New England and Eastern New York, vhere the soil is thinly spread over crystalline rocks, and he sandy districts which cover a considerable area in Virginia nd North Carolina, nearly the whole of the more level tracts etween the Atlantic and the Rocky Mountains is good agri- ultural land, while in some districts, especially on the upper Iississippi, this land has proved remarkably rich. Which oils will in the long run turn out most fertile, cannot yet e predicted. The prairie lands of the North-west have eeded least labour and have given the largest returns to their rst cultivators; but it is doubtful whether this superiority ill be maintained when protracted tillage has made artificial ids necessary, as has already happened in not a few places. ome of the soils in the Eastern and Southern States are aid to improve with cultivation, being rich in mineral con- tituents. Not less rich than the Mississippi prairies, but far naller in area, are the arable tracts of the Pacific Slope, where, n Washington especially, the loam formed by the decomposition f the trappean rocks is eminently productive. In the inner arts of the Rocky Mountain region lie many plains and valleys f great natural fertility, but dependent, so deficient is the rain- ll, upon an artificial supply of water. Were irrigation works onstructed to bring water, or artesian wells successfully sunk, rge areas might be cultivated; but land has not yet become earce enough to make the execution of great works remuner- ive, and in many regions the sources of water supply are stant or uncertain. The Mormon settlements on the east and the south of Great Salt Lake are the only considerable tract yet thus reclaimed; there are, however, others from which n equally patient industry may draw like results.

In estimating mineral resources, it is well to distinguish etween mines of gold, silver, copper, and lead on the one and, and those of coal and iron on the other. The former re numerous, and have given vast wealth to a few lucky peculators. In some parts of the Rockies and the ranges nking them to the Sierra Nevada, the traveller saw, even velve or fifteen years ago, silver mining claims staked out n every hill. But these mines are uncertain in their yield;

and the value of silver is subject to great fluctuations. Coa and iron present a surer, if less glittering gain, and they ar needed for the support of many important industries. Now while gold, silver, and lead are chiefly found in the Rock Mountain and Sierra Nevada system, copper mainly in th West and on Lake Superior, the greatest coal and iron dis tricts[1] are in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and along the line of th Alleghanies southwards into Alabama. It is chiefly in th neighbourhood of coal deposits that manufactures develop, ye not exclusively, for the water-power available along the foot o the New England hills led to the establishment of many factorie there, which still remain and flourish under changed condition receiving their coal, however, largely by sea from Nova Scotia

What has been the result of these conditions, and what d they promise?

First: An agricultural population in the Mississippi Basi already great, and capable of reaching dimensions from whic imagination recoils, for though the number of persons to th square mile will be less than in Bengal or Egypt, where th peasants' standard of comfort is incomparably lower than tha of the American farmer, it may be as dense as in the mos prosperous agricultural districts of Europe.

Secondly: An industrial population now almost equallin the agricultural,[2] concentrated chiefly in the North-easter States and along the skirts of the Alleghanies, and in larg cities springing up here and there where (as at Chicago, Clev land, Minneapolis, and St. Louis) commerce plants its centre of exchange and distribution. This industrial population grow far more swiftly than the agricultural, and the aggregate valu of manufactured products increases faster from census to censu than does that of the products of the soil.

Thirdly: A similar but very much smaller agricultural an industrial population along the Pacific, five-sixths of it with eighty miles of the coast.

Fourthly: Between the Mississippi Basin and this we

[1] There are other smaller coal districts, including one in Washington, the shores of Puget Sound. Nor ought the immensely productive mineral districts, especially those of Pennsylvania and Ohio, to pass unnoticed.

[2] The population inhabiting cities of 8000 people and upwards was in 18 still only 29·12 per cent of the total population (though in the North Atlan division it reached 51 per cent). But a large part of those engaged in mini or manufactures may be found in places below that limit of population.

eopled Pacific shore a wide and very thinly inhabited tract, ometimes quite arid, and therefore a wilderness, sometimes owing grass-bearing hills with sheep or cattle, and a few anchmen upon the hill-slopes, more rarely valleys which irri-ation has taught to wave with crops. And here and there rough this tract, redeeming it from solitude, there will lie attered mining towns, many of them quick to rise and almost quick to vanish, but others destined, if they occupy the cen-e of a mining district, to maintain a permanent importance.

Thus the enormous preponderance of population will be on he eastern side of the continental watershed. It was so in 890, — 56,000,000 of people against 6,000,000, — it is likely to main so, though the disparity may be somewhat less marked. he face of the nation will be turned eastward; and, to borrow phrase of Lowell's, the front door of their house will open on the Atlantic, the back door upon the Pacific. Faint and w, so far as we can now predict (though far greater than at is moment), will be the relations maintained with Eastern sia and Australia across the vast expanse of that ocean com-red with those that must exist with Europe, to which not ly literature and social interests, but commerce also, will bind merica by ties growing always closer and more numerous.

That the inhabitants of this territory will remain one nation the conclusion to which, as already observed, the geography the continent points. Considerations of an industrial and mmercial kind enforce this forecast. The United States, th nearly all the vegetable staples of the temperate zone, d many that may be called subtropical, has within its borders greater variety of products, mineral as well as vegetable, an any other country, and therefore a wider basis for inter-l interchange of commodities. Free Trade with other untries, desirable as it may be, is of less consequence here a vast home trade, stretching across a whole continent, s its freedom secured by the Constitution. The advantages such freedom to the wheat and maize growers of the North-st, to the cotton and rice and sugar planters of the Gulf ates, to the orange growers of Florida and the vine growers California, to the cattle men of the West and the horse eeders of Kentucky and Idaho, to the lumbermen of Maine d Washington, to the coal and iron men of Pennsylvania d the Alleghany States, to the factories of New England,

both employers and workmen, as well as to the consumin
populations of the great cities, are so obvious as to constitut
an immense security against separatist tendencies. Such a
vantages, coupled with the social and political forces discusse
in other chapters, are now amply sufficient to hold the Pacif
States to the Union, despite the obstacles which nature ha
interposed. In earlier stages of society these obstacles migh
well have proved insurmountable. Had communication bee
as difficult in the middle of the nineteenth century as it wa
in the sixteenth, the inhabitants of the Pacific coast migh
have formed a distinct nationality and grown into independe
States; while in the inner recesses of the wide mountain lan
other and probably smaller communities would have sprun
up, less advanced in culture, and each developing a type
its own. But the age we live in favours aggregation. Th
assimilative power of language, institutions, and ideas, as we
as of economic and industrial forces, is enormous, especial
when this influence proceeds from so vast a body as th
of the American people east of the Rocky Mountains, com
pared to which the dwellers on the western slope are st
but few. The failure of the Mormon attempt to found a Sta
is an instance to show how vain is the effort to escape fro
these influences; for even without an exertion of the milita
power of the United States, they must soon, by the natur
process of colonization, have been absorbed into its mas
There is, accordingly, no such reason to expect detachme
now as there might have been had neither railroads n
telegraphs existed, and California been accessible only rou
Cape Horn or across the Isthmus. Now five great trunk lin
cross the continent; and though much of the territory whi
lies between the populous margin of the Pacific and the cit
of Colorado, Nebraska, and Dakota is and must remain w
and barren, many settlements, mining, pastoral, and even ag
cultural, have begun to spring up in this intervening spa
and the unpeopled gaps are narrowing day by day. Especia
along the line of the more northerly railroads, populati
though it must always be sparse, may become practically c
tinuous. A close observer can, however, detect some diff
ences in character between Californians and the Americans
the Eastern and Mississippi States; and it is possible, thou
I think far from probable, that when immigration has ceas

ıd the Pacific coasts and valleys are peopled by the great-randchildren of Californians and Oregonians, this difference ay become more marked, and a Pacific variety of the Ameri-ın species be discernible.

We have so far been proceeding on the assumption that the habitants of the United States will be in the future what ey have been during the last three generations. It must, owever, be admitted that two agents are at work which may eate differences between those who occupy different parts of e country greater than any which now exist. One of these immigration from Europe, whereof I will only say that ere is as yet little sign that it will substantially alter any ction of the people, so strong is the assimilative power ıich the existing population exerts on the newcomers, and at it may probably, within the next few decades, begin to cline.[1] Large as it has been, it has not yet affected the ıglish spoken in any part of the country; and one may deed note that though there are marked differences of pro-ınciation there are, as respects the words, few dialectic riations over the vast area of the Union. The other is mate. Now climatic influences seem to work but slowly a national type already moulded and, so to speak, ham-ered into a definite shape by many centuries. The Eng-h race is, after all, a very recent arrival in America. Few, deed, of the progenitors of the present dwellers in the uth have been settled there for two centuries; that is to y, the present generation is at most only the sixth on which e climate has had time to tell. It is therefore quite possible at, when five or six more centuries have passed, the low-nders of the Gulf States may, under the enervating heat and alarial fevers of their summers, together with the desistence om physical exertion which that heat compels, have become fferent from what they now are; though the comparative olness and consequent reinvigorative powers of the winters, d the infiltration into their population of newcomers from

[1] I had intended to devote at least one chapter to the immigrants, setting th their numbers, their local distribution, and their influence, both political l social, upon different regions of the country. I have, however, been led the opinion that the time has not yet arrived when this large and difficult ic can be systematically handled to good purpose. While so large a part the immigrants are still raw strangers, and while so many more continue rrive, all conclusions must be provisional.

the hardier North, will be influences working in the contrar direction.[1] The moral and social sentiments predominant i a nation, and the atmosphere of ideas it breathes, tend, a education is more and more diffused, and the movements c travel to and fro become constantly brisker, to be more an more powerful forces in producing similarity of character, an similarity of character tells on the man's whole life and co stitution.

A like question has been raised regarding the whole peopl of the United States as compared with the European stock whence they sprung. The climate of their new country is on of greater extremes of heat and cold, and its air more generall stimulative, than are the climate and air of the British Isle or even of Germany and Scandinavia. That this climat should, given sufficient time, modify the physical type of race, and therewith even its intellectual type, seems onl natural. Arctic winters and scanty nutriment have, in nin centuries, markedly reduced the stature of the Norwegian who inhabit Iceland, a country which has received practicall no admixture of foreign blood, while the stern condition of their lonely life have given them mental and moral habi distinguishable from those of the natives of modern Norwa But the problem is an obscure one, for many elemen besides climate enter into it; and history supplies so fe cases in point, that the length of time required to modify physical type already settled for centuries is matter for me conjecture. There have been many instances of races fro cold or damp countries settling in warmer or dryer ones; b in all of these there has been also a mixture of blood, whi makes it hard to say how much is to be attributed to climat influences alone. What can be stated positively is, that t English race has not hitherto degenerated physically in its ne home; in some districts it may even seem to have improve The tables of life-insurance companies show that the avera of life is as long as in Western Europe. People walk le and climb mountains less than they do in England, but qui as much physical strength and agility are put forth in game and these are pursued with as much ardour. It was noted the War of Secession that the percentage of recoveries fro

[1] Of the negroes, as a race naturally fitted for these Gulf lowlands, I sh speak in a later chapter.

wounds was larger than in European wars, and the soldiers in both armies stood well the test of the long marches through rough and sometimes unhealthy regions to which they were exposed, those, perhaps, faring best who were of the purest American stock, *i.e.* who came from the districts least affected by recent immigration.[1] It has, however, already been remarked that the time during which physical conditions have been able to work on the Anglo-American race is much too short to enable any but provisional conclusions to be formed; and for the same reason it is premature to speculate upon the changes in character and intellectual tastes which either the natural scenery of the American Continent, and in particular its vast central plain, or the occupations and economic environment of the people, with their increasing tendency to prefer urban to rural life, may in the course of ages produce. The science of ethnographic sociology is still only in its infancy, and the working of the causes it examines is so subtle that centuries of experience may be needed before it becomes possible to determine definite laws of national growth.

Let us sum up the points in which physical conditions seem to have influenced the development of the American people, by trying to give a short answer to the question, What kind of home has Nature given to the nation?

She has furnished it with resources for production, that is, with potential wealth, ampler and more varied than can be found in any other country,—an immense area of fertile soil, sunshine and moisture fit for all the growths of the temperate, and even a few of the torrid, zone, a store of minerals so large as to seem inexhaustible.

She has given it a climate in which the foremost races of mankind can thrive and (save in a few districts) labour, an air in most regions not only salubrious, but more stimulating than that of their ancient European seats.

She has made communication easy by huge natural watercourses, and by the general openness and smoothness of so much of the continent as lies east of the Rocky Mountains.

In laying out a vast central and almost unbroken plain, she has destined the largest and richest region of the country

[1] Some valuable remarks on this subject will be found in Professor N. S. Shaler's interesting book, *Nature and Man in America*, from which I take these facts regarding life insurance and the experience of the Civil War.

to be the home of one nation, and one only. That the lands which lie east of this region between the Alleghanies and the Atlantic, and those which lie west of it between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific, are also occupied by that one nation is due to the fact that before the colonization of the central region had gone far, means of communication were invented which made the Alleghanies cease to be a barrier, and that before the Pacific coast had been thickly settled, the rest of the country was already so great in population, wealth, and power that its attraction was as irresistible as the moon finds the attraction of the earth to be.

Severing its home by a wide ocean from the old world of Europe on the east, and by a still wider one from the half old half new, world of Asia and Australasia on the west, she has made the nation sovereign of its own fortunes. It need fear no attacks nor even any pressure from the military and naval powers of the eastern hemisphere, and it has little temptation to dissipate its strength in contests with them. It has no doubt a strong neighbour on the North, but a friendly one, linked by many ties of interest as well as kindred, and not likely ever to become threatening. It had on the South neighbours who might have been dangerous, but fortune favoured it by making one of them hopelessly weak, and obliging the other, strong as she was, to quit possession at a critical moment. Thus is it left to itself as no great State has ever yet been in the world; thus its citizens enjoy an opportunity never before granted to a nation, of making their country what they will to have it.

These are unequalled advantages. They contain the element of immense defensive strength, of immense material prosperity. They disclose an unrivalled field for the development of an industrial civilization. Nevertheless, students of history, knowing how unpredictable is the action of what we call moral causes, that is to say, of emotional and intellectual influences as contrasted with those rooted in physical and economic facts, will not venture to base upon the most careful survey of the physical conditions of America any bolder prophecy than this, that not only will the State be powerful and the wealth of its citizens prodigious, but that the Nation will probably remain one in its government, and still more probably one in speech, in character, and in ideas.

CHAPTER XCII

THE SOUTH SINCE THE WAR

Though in the preceding chapters I have sought, so far as ossible, to describe the political phenomena of America in eneral terms, applicable to all parts of the Union, it has often een necessary to remind the reader that the conditions of the outhern States, both political and social, are in some respects xceptional, one may almost say, abnormal. The experience f this section of the country has been different from that of ne more populous and prosperous North, for the type of its ivilization was till thirty years ago determined by the exist- nce of slavery. It has suffered, and has been regenerated, by terrible war. It is still confronted by a peculiar and menacing roblem in the presence of a mass of negroes much larger nan was the whole population of the Union in A. D. 1800, per- ons who, though they are legally and industrially members of ne nation, are still virtually an alien element, unabsorbed nd unabsorbable. In the present chapter I propose to sketch brief outline the fortunes of the Southern States since the ar, and their present economic and social condition, reserving or the chapter which follows an equally succinct account of ne state of the coloured population, and their relations, resent and prospective, to the whites.

The history and the industrial situation of the Southern tates cannot be understood without a comprehension of their nysical conditions. That part of them which lies east of the lississippi consists of two regions. There is what may be lled the plantation country, a comparatively level, low, and rtile region, lying along the coast of the Atlantic and the ulf of Mexico, and stretching up the basin of the Mississippi iver. And there is the highland region, a long, broad tongue elevated land stretching down from the north into this level

plantation country, between the 39th and the 33d parallel of north latitude. Although the mountain country enclose within its network of parallel ridges many fertile valleys while upon its outer slopes, where they sink to the plain, ther is plenty of good land, the greater part of its area is covere by thick forests, or is too steep and rough for tillage. T men with capital and to the better sort of settlers generally it was uninviting, and thus while the rest of the South wa being occupied and brought under cultivation, it long remaine thinly peopled and in many districts quite wild, with scarcel any roads and no railways. As the soil was not fit for tobacc cotton, rice, or sugar, the planters had no motive to bring slav labour into it, not to add that the winter cold made it no fi dwelling place for the swarthy children of the tropics. Henc this region was left to be slowly and sparsely peopled by th poorest of the whites, and a race of small farmers and wood men grew up. They were rude and illiterate, cut off from th movements of the world, and having little in common with th inhabitants of the low country east and west of them, ye hardy and vigorous, with the virtues, and some of the fierc ness, of simple mountaineers, honest among themselves, an with a dangerously keen sense of personal honour, but hostil to the law and its ministers. While the whole cultivation o the plain country of Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Tenne see, and Kentucky was done by negroes, and these State more particularly Virginia and the Carolinas, were ruled b an oligarchy of wealthy planters, negroes were scarcely to b seen in the mountains of Eastern Kentucky, Western Virgini North Carolina, and Eastern Tennessee, and the scanty whit population of these mountains had no influence on the conduc of public affairs. Hence when the Civil War broke out, th race of hillmen, disliking slavery, and having no love for th planters, adhered to the Union cause, and sent thousands o stalwart recruits into the Union armies. Even to-day, thoug as we shall presently see, it has been much affected by th running of railways through it, the opening of mines and th setting up of iron works, the mountain land of the Sout remains unlike the plain country both in the character of it inhabitants and in the physical conditions which have create that character, conditions which, as will appear in the s

uel, are an important factor in the so-called Negro Prob-
m.

Excluding these highlanders, — and excluding also the three
order States which did not secede, Maryland, Kentucky, and
Missouri, — there were at the end of the war three classes of
ersons in the South. There was the planting aristocracy,
hich the war had ruined. The elder men had seen their
tates laid waste, such savings as they possessed exhausted,
eir whole negro property, estimated (over the whole country),
nearly $2,000,000, gone from them into freedom. Of the
unger men, a large part had fallen in the field. All, old
d young, had no capital left with which to work the estates
at still remained in their hands. Land and negroes had
en their only wealth, for there were practically no manu-
ctures and little commerce, save at the half dozen seaports.
redit was gone; and everything, even the railroads, was in
ins. Thus the country was, as a whole, reduced to poverty,
d the old plantation life broken up for ever.

The second class consisted of the poor or, as they were
ten called, "mean" whites, who, in the lowlands and outside
e few cities, included all the white population below the
vel of the planters. On them, too, slavery had left its
teful stamp. Considering themselves above field labour,
hich in any case they could hardly have undertaken in the
t regions along the Atlantic and the Gulf coasts, they con-
acted habits of idleness and unthrift; they were uneducated,
iftless, unenterprising, and picked up their living partly by
languid cultivation of patches of land, and by hunting,
rtly by hanging about the plantations in a dependent con-
ion, doing odd jobs and receiving occasional aid. To them
e war brought good, for not only was labour dignified by
e extinction of slavery, but their three or four years of
vice in the Confederate armies called out their finer quali-
s and left them more of men than it found them. More-
er with the depression of the planting oligarchy their social
eriority and political subservience became less marked.

The third class were the negroes, then about four millions
number, whose sudden liberation threw a host of difficulties
on the States where they lived, and upon the Federal govern-
nt, which felt responsible not only for the good order of

the reconquered South, but in a special manner for those whos freedom its action had procured. They were — even the ma jority of the (comparatively few) free blacks in the towns — illiterate, and scarcely more fit to fend for themselves an guide their course as free citizens than when they or thei fathers had been landed from the slave ship.

In this state of things, three great problems presented them selves to the Federal government whose victorious armies wer occupying the South. How should the State governments in th States that had seceded and been conquered be re-established What provision should be made for the material support an protection in personal freedom of the emancipated slaves? T what extent should not merely passive but also active civi rights — that is to say, rights of participating in the goverr ment as electors or officials — be granted to these freedmen?

The solution of these problems occupied twelve eventfu years from 1865 to 1877, and constitutes one of the most intri cate chapters in American history. I must refrain from dis cussing either the party conflicts at Washington, or the subtl legal questions that were raised in Congress and in the courts and be content with touching on the action taken by the Fe eral and State governments so far and only so far as it affecte the relations of the negroes and the whites.

The first action was taken by the Southern States themselve Conformably to his amnesty proclamation of 1863, Presider Lincoln had recognized new State governments, loyal to th Union, in Tennessee and Louisiana, as he had previously don in Arkansas. When the war had ended, the other reconquere States (except Texas) took a course similar to that which th loyalists of those States had taken. The white inhabitant except those excluded by the terms of President Johnson amnesty proclamation of May, 1865, chose conventions: thes conventions enacted new constitutions: and under these co stitutions, new State legislatures were elected. These legisla ures promptly accepted the amendment (the thirteenth) the Federal Constitution by which (in 1865) slavery wa abolished, and then went on to pass laws for the regulation negro labour and against vagrancy, laws which, though repr sented, and probably in good faith, as necessary for the contr of a mass of ignorant beings suddenly turned adrift, with no o

control them and no habits of voluntary industry or thrift, ept the negroes in a state of inferiority, and might have been worked as to reduce a large part of them to practical servi- ude. This was a false move, for it excited alarm and resent- ent at the North; and it was accompanied by conflicts here nd there between the whites, especially the disbanded Con- derate soldiers, and the coloured people; conflicts the more grettable, because the slaves had, during the war, behaved xcellently towards the defenceless white women and children n the plantations, and had given their former masters little nothing to revenge. It was, therefore, in a suspicious mper that Congress approached the question of the re- ttlement of the South. The victors had shown unexampled emency to the vanquished, but they were not prepared to ss and be friends in the sense of at once readmitting those hom they deemed and called "rebels" to their old full consti- tional rights. Slavery, which at the beginning of the war ey had for the most part disclaimed the purpose to abolish, nd now become utterly detestable to them, and the negro an bject of special sympathy. They felt bound to secure for m, after all they had done and suffered, the amplest protec- on. It might perhaps have been wiser to revert to the neral maxims of American statesmanship, and rely upon e natural recuperative forces and the interest which the outh itself had in re-establishing order and just government. ut the Northern leaders could not be expected to realize how mpletely the idea of another revolt had vanished from the inds of the Southern people, who, in a characteristically nerican fashion, had already accepted the inevitable, perceiv- g that both slavery and the legal claim to secede were gone r ever. And these leaders — more particularly those who sat Congress — were goaded into more drastic measures than flection might have approved by the headstrong violence of esident Andrew Johnson, who, as a Southern States Rights an of the old type, had announced that the States were titled to resume their former full rights of self-government, d who, while stretching his powers to effect this object, d been denouncing Congress in unmeasured terms. Very fferent might have been the course of events had the patient sdom of Lincoln lived to guide the process of resettlement.

Under the influence of these sentiments, Congress refused to allow the members elected from the reconquered States to take their seats, and enacted a statute establishing a Freedmen's Bureau, armed with large powers for the oversight and support of the liberated negroes. Passed in 1865, and in 1866 continued for two years longer, this Act practically superseded the legislation of the reconquered States regarding the coloured people. Congress then passed and proposed for acceptance by the States (June, 1866) an amendment (the fourteenth) to the Federal Constitution, which conferred citizenship, State as well as Federal, on all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, forbade legislation by a State abridging the privileges or immunities of a citizen of the United States, and provided for reducing the representation in Congress of any State in proportion to the number of its citizens excluded from the suffrage. As all danger of a return of slavery had already vanished, it was a tremendous forward move to put this pressure upon the Southern States to confer full voting rights upon their negroes. These States, however, would probably have done well to accept the amendment, and might perhaps have accepted it had they realized what was the temper of the party dominant at the North. But they complained of the proposal to cut down representation in respect of excluded citizens, arguing that there were Northern States where colour was a ground of exclusion, and which, nevertheless, would suffer much less than the Southern States because the number of their coloured residents was far smaller; and they also resented a provision in the amendment which disqualified from voting or office all persons who having ever taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States had been concerned in "insurrection or rebellion against the same." Accordingly all these States except Tennessee, rejected the amendment. This further stimulated the anger and suspicion of Congress, which proceeded (March 2, 1867) to pass the so-called Reconstruction Act (a bill "to provide efficient governments for the insurrectionary States") designed to create legitimate governments in the States not yet readmitted to the Union (ignoring the governments set up by the white inhabitants), and to determine the conditions proper for their readmission. By this

ct these States, that is, the whole seceding South except ennessee, were divided into five military districts, each to governed by a brigadier-general of the Federal army, until ch time as a State convention should have framed a new nstitution, the Fourteenth Amendment have been ratified and e State have been duly readmitted. The delegates to each nvention were to be elected by all the male citizens, excluding such as, having previously sworn to support the Federal onstitution, had been concerned in the late rebellion; and it as to these same voters that the new Constitution when amed was to be submitted for ratification. This provision, hile it admitted the negroes to be voters and delegates to e conventions, debarred from both functions most of the ading whites, and left the conventions to be "run" by those w whites who had remained faithful to the Union, and by venturers who had come from the North in the track the Federal armies. The Reconstruction Act was duly card out; conventions were held; constitutions granting equal ffrage to all, blacks and whites, were enacted, and new State vernments installed accordingly, in which, however, the leadg white men of each State, since not yet pardoned, could tain no place either as legislators or as officials. By this ocedure, six States were in 1868 readmitted to Congress, as ving satisfied the conditions imposed, and the remaining ates within the two years following. In July, 1868, the urteenth Amendment became a part of the Constitution, ving been accepted by three-fourths of the States, and in arch, 1870, the Fifteenth Amendment, forbidding the voting ht of citizens to be "denied or abridged on account of race, lour, or previous condition of servitude," also became by nilar acceptance part of the Constitution and binding on all e States. With this, and with the passing in 1870 and 71 of penal laws, commonly called the Force Acts, inded to protect the negroes in the exercise of the sufge, the direct interference of the Federal legislature led. In 1872, by the general Amnesty Act, it readmitted e great bulk of the ex-Confederates to full political hts.

Meanwhile, how had things been going in the Southern ates themselves? All the leading whites having been dis-

qualified from voting or taking part in the government, th only factors or forces left were, —

First, such whites as had adhered to the Union throughou the war — in most States neither a numerous nor an influentia body.

Secondly, a vast mass of negroes suddenly set free, and abs lutely destitute, not only of political experience, but even c the most rudimentary political ideas.

Thirdly, men sent down from the North as agents of th Freedmen's Bureau, or otherwise in connection with the Federa government, and persons who had come of themselves in th hope of profiting by such opportunities for enrichment as th abnormal conditions of the country might create.

The voting strength was, of course, with the negroes, esp cially in South Carolina and the Gulf States (except Texas) and a certain number were chosen to sit in the legislatures an to fill the less important offices. In the legislatures of Sout Carolina and Mississippi, they formed the majority; and fro the latter State they sent one of themselves to the Federa Senate. But leadership, of course, fell to the whites, wh alone were capable of it, and chiefly to those white adve turers whose scanty stock of portable property won for the the name of "carpet-baggers." They organized the negro for elections, State and local, they tampered with the elector lists and stuffed the ballot-boxes,[1] they "ran" the legislature They pounced upon the lucrative places, satisfying negro clain with posts of less consequence,[2] they devised the variou methods by which taxation was increased, debt rolled u offices created and lavishly paid, frauds of every kind pe petrated for the benefit of themselves and their friends. Suc a Saturnalia of robbery and jobbery has seldom been seen any civilized country, and certainly never before under th forms of free self-government. The coloured voters cou hardly be blamed for blindly following the guides who repr sented to them the party to which they owed their liberty

[1] Sometimes the beautifully simple plan was adopted of providing the ball box, carefully locked and sealed at its proper aperture, with a sliding side.

[2] In South Carolina, in 1875, according to the trustworthy evidence of Go ernor Chamberlain, two hundred persons had been appointed justices of t peace, with a certain civil as well as criminal jurisdiction, who could neith read nor write.

d as they had little property, taxation did not press upon em nor the increase of debt alarm them. Those among the groes to whom the chief profit accrued were the preachers, ıo enjoyed a sort of local influence, and could sometimes mmand the votes of their fellows, and the legislators, who ere accustomed, in South Carolina, for instance, to be paid a v dollars for every bill they passed.[1] But nine tenths of the icit gains went to the whites. Many of them were persons infamous character who ultimately saved themselves from stice by flight. For the time they enjoyed absolute impu-ty, without even that check which public opinion imposes on e worst rulers when they themselves belong to the district ich they rule.

The position of these adventurers was like that of a Roman ovincial governor in the later days of the Republic, or an glish official in the East Indies in the earlier days of the mpany's conquests, save that they had less to fear from osequent prosecution than Verres, and less from a parlia-ntary inquiry than the companions of Clive. The very urities with which the Federal system surrounds State au-omy contributed to encourage their audacity. The National vernment was not responsible, because the whole machinery State government was in form complete and to all outward pearance in normal action. But as voting power lay with ose who were wholly unfit for citizenship, and had no erest, as taxpayers, in good government, as the legislatures re reckless and corrupt, the judges for the most part sub-vient, the Federal military officers bound to support what rported to be the constitutional authorities of the State, ngress distant and little inclined to listen to the complaints those whom it distrusted as rebels,[2] greed was unchecked l roguery unabashed. The methods of plunder were numer-. Every branch of administration became wasteful. Public

[1] An anecdote is told of an old negro in North Carolina who, being discovered ating the fee he had received for his vote in the legislature, said with a ckle, "I have been sold eleven times in my life, and this is the first time er got the money."

[2] Nearly the whole representation in Congress of these States was in the ds of the then ruling Republican party. The Southern members were ely accomplices in the local misgovernment here described, nearly half hem being carpet-baggers from the North, while few of the Northern abers had any knowledge of it, some perhaps not caring to enquire.

contracts were jobbed, and the profits shared. Extravagan salaries were paid to legislators; extravagant charges allowe for all sorts of work done at the public cost. But perhaps th commonest form of robbery, and that conducted on the larges scale, was for the legislature to direct the issue of bonds in ai of a railroad or other public work, these bonds being the delivered to contractors who sold them, shared the proceed with the governing Ring, and omitted to execute the work Much money was however taken in an even more direct fashio from the State treasury or from that of the local authority and as not only the guardians of the public funds, but ever in many cases, the courts of law, were under the control o the thieves, discovery was difficult and redress unattainabl In this way the industrious and property-holding classes sa the burdens of the State increase, with no power of arrestin the process. In North Carolina, $14,000,000 worth of railroa bonds were issued, and no railway made. In Alabama, th State debt rose in four years from $8,356,000 to $25,503,00 with little or nothing to show for it. In Mississippi, the Stat levy had been ten cents on the $100 of assessed value of land In 1874 it had risen to fourteen times that rate. In Sout Carolina, the State debt leapt in four years from $5,407,000 t $18,515,000, and Governor Moses, not content with his shar of the plunder, openly sold his pardons, of which he grante 457 in two years. But the climax was reached in Louisian where, in a single year, the State debt was increased fourfol and the local debt twofold, while in four years' time the tot State and city indebtedness was rolled up by the sum o $54,000,000, all of which went to the spoilers, and nothing t permanent improvements.

Whether owing to those amiable traits in the national cha acter which often survive the sterner virtues, or to the fa that the thieves were too busy filling their pockets to hav leisure for other outrages, this misgovernment was accomp nied by less oppression and cruelty than might have bee expected. Some such acts there doubtless were, particular in the rougher districts of the extreme South-west; and in se eral States the dominant faction, not satisfied with the presen of Federal troops, sought to preserve order by creating bodi of State guards or State police, or a negro militia. In M

ssipi the coloured people were enrolled in a "Loyal League." nlike the Federal civil officials, who were often disreputable nd unscrupulous partisans, sometimes most improperly com- ining the headship of the local Republican organization with n office demanding impartiality,[1] the Federal military officers, nough their conduct was sometimes impugned, seem on the hole to have behaved with uprightness and good sense, making eir military control as gentle as such a thing ever can be. Nor d the negroes, untutored as they were, and jubilant in their ew freedom, show the turbulence or the vindictiveness which ight have been looked for in a less kindly race. Neverthe- ss, disorders broke out. A secret combination, called the u Klux Klan, said to have been originally formed in Ten- essee by youths for purposes of amusement, spread rapidly rough the country, and became credited with the numerous etty outrages which, during 1868 and the following years, ere perpetrated upon negroes, and (less frequently) upon hites supposed to be in sympathy with negroes, in the rural outh. Many of these outrages were probably the work of llage ruffians who had no connection with any organization, ill less any political motive. But the impossibility of dis- vering those who committed them, and the absence of any cal efforts to repress them, showed the profound discontent the better class of whites with the governments which the loured vote had installed, while unfortunately confirming ongress in its suspicion of the former rebels as being still heart enemies of the Union and the negro. No open resist- ce to the Federal troops was attempted; but neither their tivity nor the penal laws passed by Congress were effective checking the floggings, house-burnings, and murders which, ring these years, disgraced some districts. Meanwhile, the orth grew weary of repression, and began to be moved by e accounts that reached it of "carpet-bag government." A litical reaction, due to other causes, had made itself felt in e North; and the old principle of leaving the States to them- ves gained more and more upon the popular mind, even thin the still dominant Republican party. Though some of

[1] In Louisiana, for instance, the Federal marshal, who was entitled to call the Federal troops to aid him, was for a time chairman of the Republican te Committee.

its prominent leaders desired, perhaps not without a view party advantage, to keep down the South, they were ove borne by the feeling, always strong in America, that eve community to which self-government has been granted mu be left to itself to work out its own salvation, and that co tinued military occupation could not be justified where revolt was apprehended. The end came in 1876–77. Betwee 1869 and 1876, the whites had in every Southern State exce South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana, regained control the government, and in 1876 those three States were al recovered.[1] The circumstances were different, according to t character of the population in each State. In some a unio of the moderate white Republicans with the Democrat brought about by the disgust of all property holders at t scandals they saw and at the increase to their burdens tax-payers, had secured legitimately chosen majorities, a ejected the corrupt officials. In some the same result w attained by paying or otherwise inducing the negroes not to to the polls, or by driving them away by threats or actu violence. Once possessed again of a voting majority, t whites, all of whom had by 1872 been relieved of their di abilities, took good care, by a variety of devices, legal a extra-legal, to keep that majority safe; and in no State h their control of the government been since shaken. Preside Hayes withdrew, in 1877, such Federal troops as were still le at the South, and none have ever since been despatched thith

This sketch has been given, not so much because it is curious phase in the history of democracy, and one not like ever to recur, either in the United States or elsewhere, as cause it has determined and explained the whole subseque course of events and the present attitude, whereof more an of the Southern people. That Congress made some mistak is proved by the results. Among those results must be re oned not merely the load of needless debt imposed upon t Southern States, and the retardation of their recovery from t losses of the war, but the driving of all their respectable wh citizens into the Democratic party and their alienation fr

[1] Those States in which the whites first recovered control, such as Georg have generally fared best subsequently. They have had less debt to ca and commercial confidence was sooner restored.

Republicans of the North, together with the similar aggre-
ion of the negroes in the Republican party, and consequent
ation of a so-called "colour line" in politics. Habits of law-
sness have moreover been perpetuated among the whites, and
re has been formed in both parties the pernicious practice
tampering with elections, sometimes by force and sometimes
fraud, a practice which strikes at the very root of free popu-
government.

But was the great and capital act of the Republican party
en it secured the grant of the suffrage to the negroes *en*
one of those mistakes? To nearly all Europeans such a
o seemed and still seems monstrous. No people could be
gined more hopelessly unfit for political power than this
t of slaves; and their unfitness became all the more dan-
ous because the classes among whom the new voters ought
have found guidance were partly disfranchised and partly
ed into hostility. American eyes, however, see the matter
different light. To them it is an axiom, that without the
rage there is no true citizenship, and the negro would have
eared to be scarcely free had he received only the private
passive, and not also the public and active rights of a
en. "I realized in 1867," says General Wade Hampton,
of the most distinguished leaders of the South, "that
n a man had been made a citizen of the United States, he
d not be debarred from voting on account of his colour.
exclusion would be opposed to the entire theory of
blican institutions."[1] It is true that there were Northern
es, such as even the New England Connecticut and the
New England Ohio, as well as Michigan and Pennsyl-
a, in which persons of colour were so debarred.[2] But the
itionist movement and the war had given an immense
ulus to the abstract theory of human rights, and had made
negro so much an object of sympathy to the Northern
le, that these restrictions were vanishing before the doc-
of absolute democratic equality and the rights of man
an. There was, moreover, a practical argument of some
ht. The gift of the suffrage presented itself to the

[1] *North American Review* for March, 1879.

[2] Connecticut as late as 1865 and Ohio as late as 1867 declined to extend suffrage to negroes.

Northern statesmen as the alternative to continuance of mi
itary government. Without the suffrage, the negro migh
have been left defenceless and neglected, unimproved an
unimproving. In the words of another distinguished South
ern, the late Mr. Justice Lamar, "In the unaccustome
relation into which the white and coloured people of th
South were suddenly forced, there would have been a na
ural tendency on the part of the former masters, still i
the possession of the land and intelligence of the countr
and of its legislative power, to use an almost absolute a
thority, and to develop the new freedman according to the
own idea of what was good for him. This would have resulte
in a race distinction, and with such incidents of the old syste
as would have discontented the negro and dissatisfied th
general sentiment of the country. If slavery was to be abo
ished, there could be nothing short of complete abolition, fre
from any of the affinities of slavery; and this would not hav
been effected so long as there existed any inequality before th
law. The ballot was therefore a protection of the neg
against any such condition, and enabled him to force his inte
ests upon the consideration of the South." [1]

The American view that "the suffrage is the sword and shie
of our law, the best armament that liberty offers to the citizen
does not at once commend itself to a European, who conceiv
that every government is bound to protect the unenfranchise
equally with the enfranchised citizen. But it must be remem
bered that in the United States this duty is less vigilant
performed than in England or Germany, and that there we
special difficulties attending its performance under a Feder
system, which leaves the duty, save where Federal legislatio
is involved, to the authorities of the several States.

It has been usual to charge those who led Congress wi
another and less noble motive for granting electoral rights
the negroes, viz.: the wish to secure their votes for the R
publican party. Motives are always mixed; and doubtle
this consideration had its weight. Yet it was not a pure
selfish consideration. As it was by the Republican party th
the war had been waged and the negro set free, the Republic
leaders were entitled to assume that his protection could

[1] *North American Review* for March, 1879.

cured only by their continued ascendancy. That ascendancy as not wisely used. But the circumstances were so novel d perplexing, that perhaps no statesmanship less sagacious an President Lincoln's could have handled them with success. With the disappearance of the carpet-bag and negro governents, the third era in the political history of the South since e war began. The first had been that of exclusively white ffrage; the second, that of predominantly negro suffrage. In e third, universal suffrage and complete legal equality were on perceived to mean in practice the full supremacy of the hites. To dislodge the coloured man from his rights was possible, for they were secured by the Federal Constitution hich prevails against all State action. The idea of disturbg them was scarcely entertained. Even at the election of 1872 e Southern Democrats no more expected to repeal the Fifenth Amendment than the English Tories expected at the elecn of 1874 to repeal the Irish Church Disestablishment Act of 69. But the more they despaired of getting rid of the amendent, the more resolved were the Southern people to prevent it om taking any effect which could endanger their supremacy. ey did not hate the negro, certainly not half so much as ey hated his white leaders by whom they had been robbed. Ve have got," they said, "to save civilization," and if civiliion could be saved only by suppressing the coloured vote, ey were ready to suppress it. This was the easier, because hile most of the carpet-baggers had fled, nearly all the respectle whites of the South, including those who had been Whigs fore the war and who had opposed secession, were now united the new Democratic, or rather anti-negro party. A further idence of the power of the motives which have swayed them y be found in the fact that nearly every Northern man who s of late years gone South for commercial purposes, has fore long ranged himself with this anti-negro party, whater his previous "affiliations" may have been.

The modes of suppression have not been the same in all dists and at all times. At first there was a good deal of what called "bulldozing," *i.e.* rough treatment and terrorism, plied to frighten the coloured men from coming to or voting the polls. Afterwards, the methods were less harsh. Registions were so managed as to exclude negro voters, arrange-

ments for polling were contrived in such wise as to lead the vote to the wrong place so that his vote might be refused; and, if the necessity arose, the Republican candidates were counted out, or the election returns tampered with. "I would stuff a ballot box," said a prominent man, "in order to have a good, honest government;" and he said it in good faith, and with no sense of incongruity. Sometimes the local negro preachers were warned or paid to keep their flocks away. More humorous devices were not disdained, as when free tickets to a travelling circus were distributed among the negroes, and the circus paid to hold its exhibition at a place and hour which prevented them from coming to vote. South Carolina enacted an ingenious law which provides that there shall be eight ballot-boxes for as many posts to be filled at the election, that a vote shall not be counted unless placed in the proper box, and that the presiding officer shall not be bound to tell the voter which is the proper box in which each vote ought to be deposited. The illiterate negroes still often vote in the wrong box, the boxes being frequently shifted to disconcert instructions given beforehand, that a large part of their votes are lost, while the illiterate white is apt to receive the benevolent and not forbidden help of the presiding officer.

Notwithstanding these impediments, the negro long maintained the struggle, valuing the vote as the symbol of his freedom, and fearing to be re-enslaved if the Republican party should be defeated. Leaders and organizers were found in the Federal office-holders, of course all Republicans, a numerous class, — Mr. Nordhoff, a careful and judicious observer, says there were in 1875 three thousand in Georgia alone, — and a class whose members virtually held their offices on condition of doing their political work; being liable to be removed if they failed in their duty, as the Turks remove a Vali who sends up too little money to Stamboul. After 1884, however, when the presidency of the United States passed to a Democrat, some of these office-holders were replaced by Democrats and the rest became less zealous. It was, moreover, already by that time clear that the whites, being again in the saddle, meant to stay there, and the efforts of the Republican organizers grew feebler as they lost hope. Their friends at the North were exasperated, not without reason, for the gift of suffrage to the negroes had resulted in securing to the

outh a larger representation in Congress and in presidential
lections than it enjoyed before the war, or would have en-
oyed had the negroes been left unenfranchised. They argued,
nd truly, that where the law gives a right, the law ought to
ecure the exercise thereof; and when the Southern men
eplied that the negroes were ignorant, they rejoined that all
ver the country there were myriads of ignorant voters,
ostly recent immigrants, whom no one thought of excluding.
ccordingly in 1890, having a majority in both Houses of
ongress and a President of their own party, the Republican
aders introduced a bill subjecting the control of Federal
ections to officers to be appointed by the President, in the
ope of thus calling out a full negro vote, five sixths of which
ould doubtless have gone to their party. The measure
ppeared to dispassionate observers quite constitutional, and
ne mischief it was designed to remedy was palpable. It
xcited, however, great irritation at the South, uniting in
pposition to it nearly all whites of every class, while no
rresponding enthusiasm on its behalf was evoked at the
orth. It passed the House, but was dropped in the Senate
nder the threat of an obstructive resistance by the (then
emocratic) minority. Secure, however, as the dominance of
ne whites seems now to be against either Northern legis-
tion or negro revolt, the Southern people are still uneasy
nd sensitive on the subject, and have been held together
a serried party phalanx by this one colour question, to
ne injury of their political life, which is thus prevented
om freely developing on the lines of the other questions
at from time to time arise. So keen is their recollection
the carpet-bag days, so intense the alarm at any possibility
their return, that internal dissensions, such as those which
e growth of the Farmers' Alliance party has lately evoked,
e seldom permitted to give Republican candidates a chance
a seat in Congress or of any considerable State office.

These remarks apply to the true South, and neither to the
ountain regions, where, owing to the absence of the negro
ement, there is, save in the wider valleys, still a strong
epublican party, nor to the Border States, Maryland, West
rginia, Kentucky and Missouri, in which the coloured voters
e not numerous enough to excite alarm. When it is desired

to eliminate their influence on elections, a common plan is to bribe them. In Louisville one is told that quite a small payment secures abstention. To induce them to vote for a Democrat is, to their credit be it said, much more costly.

This horror of negro supremacy is the only point in which the South cherishes its old feelings. Hostility to the Northern people has almost disappeared. No sooner was Lee's surrender at Appomattox Court House known over the country, than the notion of persisting in efforts for secession and the hope of maintaining slavery expired. With that remarkable power of accepting an accomplished fact which in America is compatible with an obstinate resistance up to the moment when the fact becomes accomplished, the South felt that a new era had arrived, to which they must forthwith adapt themselves. They were not ashamed of the war. They were and remain proud of it, as one may see by the provisions very recently made by some States for celebrating the birthday of General Robert E. Lee or of Ex-President Jefferson Davis. Just because they felt that they had fought well, they submitted with little resentment, and it has become a proverb among them that the two classes which still cherish bitterness are the two classes that did not fight, — the women and the clergy. Even when fresh hostility was aroused by the reconstructive action of Congress in 1866 and 1867, and the abuses of carpet-bag rule, no one dreamt of renewing the old struggle. Not, however, till the whites regained control between 1870 and 1876 did the industrial regeneration of the country fairly begin. Two discoveries coincided with that epoch which have had an immense effect in advancing material prosperity, and changing the current of men's thoughts. The first was the exploration of the mineral wealth of the highland core of the country. In the western parts of Virginia and North Carolina, in the eastern parts of Tennessee, the northern parts of Georgia and Alabama, both coal and iron, not to speak of other minerals, have been found in enormous quantities, and often in such close juxtaposition that the production of pig iron and steel can be carried on with exceptional cheapness. Thus, Northern capital has been drawn into the country: Southern men have had a new field for enterprise, and have themselves begun to accumulate capital: prosperous industries have been created

nd a large working-class population, both white and coloured, as grown up in many places, while the making of new rail-ays has not only given employment to the poorer classes, it has stimulated manufacture and commerce in other direc-ons. The second discovery was that of the possibility of xtracting oil from the seeds of the cotton plant, which had rmerly been thrown away, or given to hogs to feed on. The roduction of this oil has swelled to great proportions, making e cultivation of cotton far more profitable, and has become potent factor in the extension of cotton cultivation and e general prosperity of the country. Most of the crop now ised, which averages eight millions of bales, and in 1894 was pected to exceed ten millions (being more than double that nich was raised, almost wholly by slave labour, before the ar), is now raised by white farmers; while the mills which in and weave it into marketable goods are daily increasing d building up fresh industrial communities. The methods agriculture have been improved; and new kinds of cultiva-on introduced: the raising of fruit, for instance, and espe-ally of oranges, has become in certain districts a lucrative dustry. Nor has the creation of winter health resorts in e beautiful mountain land of North Carolina, and further uth in South Carolina and Florida, been wholly without portance, for the Northern people who flock thither learn know the South, and themselves diffuse new ideas among e backward population of those districts. Thus from various uses there has come to be a sense of stir and movement d occupation with practical questions, and what may be led a commercialization of society, which has, in some ces, transformed Southern life. Manual labour is no longer emed derogatory by the poor whites, nor commerce by the ns of the old planting aristocracy. Farmers no doubt com-in, as they do everywhere in the United States; yet it is good sign that the average size of farms has been, in the uth-eastern States, decreasing, the number of farmers and o the number of owners increasing, while the number of ants who pay their rent in money instead of in kind almost ubled between 1880 and 1890. As capital, which used to be efly invested in slaves, has increased and become more gen-lly diffused, it is more and more placed in permanent im-

provements, and especially in city buildings. Cities indee have largely grown and are still growing, especially of cour in the mining regions; and in the cities a new middle class h sprung up, formed partly by the elevation of the poorer cla and partly by the depression of the old planting class, whi has made the contrast between the social equality of Norther and the aristocratic tone of Southern society far less mark than it was before the war.

While slavery lasted the South was, except of course regarded the children of planters and of the few merchants, illiterate country. Even in 1870 the South-eastern States h only 30 per cent of their population of school age enrolled school attendants, and the South central and western States on 34 per cent. The Reconstruction constitutions of 1867–70 co tained valuable provisions for the establishment of schools; a the rise of a new generation, which appreciates the worth education and sees how the North has profited by it, has induc a wholesome activity. In 1890, the percentages of childr enrolled to school age population had risen to 59 and 62 in t South-east and South-west respectively.[1] It is no doubt tr that the sum expended on schools is very unequal in the vario States, — Arkansas, for instance, spends twice as much as Nor Carolina, though her State debt is twice as great, and her weal *per capita* of children, about the same; true, also, that the e penditure is much less than in the North or West, — Iowa, instance, spends five times as much as Arkansas, with or twice as much wealth; — true, further, that the number of da of attendance by each pupil in the year is much smaller in t Southern States (62·2 in the South-eastern States, 56·2 in t South central and western, as compared with 109 in the Nor eastern States). Still the progress is great, when one cons ers the comparative poverty of the Southern States, and t predominantly rural character of their very sparse populati

[1] Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1890–91. The census retu of 1890 give 1,333,395 white pupils enrolled out of a total white population 5,592,149 in the South-eastern States, and in the South central and west States, 1,873,172 white pupils to a total white population of 7,487,576. proportion of coloured pupils to population is of course smaller. See the ures given in next chapter.

"School age" is taken in the United States as covering the years from 18 inclusive.

Any one seeking to disparage the South need not want for ints to dwell upon. He might remark that illiteracy is far ore common than in the North or West; that there is little ading even among those who can read, — one need only walk rough the streets of a Southern city and look into the few okstores to be convinced of this, — and far less of that kind culture which is represented by lecture courses or by liter- y and scientific journals and societies. He would observe at hotels, railway stations, refreshment-rooms, indeed all the aterial appliances of travelling comfort in which the North ines, are on a far lower level, and that the scattered population neglects its roads that they are often impassable. Life, he ght say, is comparatively rough, except in a few of the der cities, such as Richmond and Charleston; it has in many gions the character of border life in a half-settled country. d above all, he might dilate upon the frequency of homicide, d the small value that seems to be set upon human life, if e may judge from the imperfect and lenient action of the urts, which, to be sure, is often supplemented by private ngeance. Yet to the enumeration of these and other faults n of slavery and the spirit which slavery fostered, it would rightly answered that the true way to judge the former slave ates, is to compare them as they are now with what they were en the war ended. Everywhere there is progress; in some gions such progress, that one may fairly call the South a v country. The population is indeed unchanged, for few tlers come from the North, and no part of the United States s within the present century received so small a share of ropean immigration.[1] Slavery was a fatal deterrent while lasted, and of late years the climate, the presence of the gro, and the notion that work was more abundant elsewhere, ve continued to deflect in a more northerly direction the eam that flows from Europe. But the old race, which is, cept in Texas (where there is a small Mexican and a larger rman element) and in Louisiana, a pure English and Scoto- sh race, full of natural strength, has been stimulated and in- orated by the changed conditions of its life. It sees in the neral and agricultural resources of its territory a prospect

[1] In North Carolina the foreign born are only .2 of the population, in Missis- i only .6.

of wealth and population rivalling those of the Middle ar
Western States. It has recovered its fair share of influence
the national government. It has no regrets over slavery, f
it recognizes the barbarizing influence that slavery exerte
Neither does it cherish any dreams of separation. It has now
pride in the Union as well as in its State, and is in some wa
more fresh and sanguine than the North, because less cloy
by luxury than the rich are there, and less discouraged by th
spread of social unrest than the thoughtful have been ther
But for one difficulty, the South might well be thought to
the most promising part of the Union, that part whose advan
is likely to be swiftest, and whose prosperity will be not th
least secure.

This difficulty, however, is a serious one. It lies in th
presence of seven millions of negroes.

CHAPTER XCIII

PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE NEGRO

The total coloured population of the United States was in 00 7,470,040, a number greater than that of the English ople in the reign of Queen Anne, and one which might any- ere but in North America be deemed to form a considerable ion. Of this total, seven millions (in round numbers) were he old Slave States, and it is of these only that the present pter will speak.[1] To understand their distribution in these tes, the reader will do well to recall what was said in the preceding chapter regarding the physical features of the th, for it is by those features that the growth of the oured population in the various regions of the country has n determined. Though man is of all animals, except perhaps dog, that which shows the greatest capacity for supporting climates from Borneo to Greenland, it remains true that tain races of men thrive and multiply only in certain nates. As the races of Northern Europe have been hitherto ble to maintain themselves in the torrid zone, so the ican race, being of tropical origin, dwindles away wherever as to encounter cold winters. In what used to be called Border States — Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri — the oured element increases but slowly, or tends slightly to rease.[2] In West Virginia, East Kentucky, East Tennessee, Western North Carolina, the negro is practically un- wn in the highest and coolest spots, and in the other parts hat elevated country has scarcely been able to hold his . It is in the low warm regions that lie near the Gulf eam and the Gulf of Mexico, and especially in the sea- nds of South Carolina and on the banks of the lower Miss- ppi that he finds the conditions which are at once most

[1] The total white population of these States was in 1890 13,079,725 and the red 6,741,941.

[2] Kentucky shows a small decrease from 1880 to 1890. There is also an ab- e decrease of coloured population in seven other States, — Maine, New pshire, Vermont, Michigan, Nevada, California, Idaho, — and in Arizona.

favourable to his development and most unfavourable to th of the whites. Accordingly it is the eight States nearest t Gulf, — South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississip Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, that contain more than h the negro population, which in three of them, South Caroli Mississippi, and Louisiana, exceeds the number of the whit These eight States show an increase of the coloured populati from 1880 to 1890, at the rate of 19.1 per cent,[1] while in t rest of the South the rate was only 5.5 per cent. It is th clear that the negro centre of population is more and m shifting southward, and that the African is leaving the cold higher, and drier lands for regions more resembling his anci seats in the Old World.

A not less important question is the proportion between negroes and the whites. In 1790 the negroes were 19.3 cent or nearly one-fifth of the whole population of the Uni In 1880 they were 13.1 per cent; in 1890 11.9 per cent, considerably less than one-eighth. Their rate of increase o the whole country in the last decade was 13.11, while t of the whites was 26.68. Even in the former Slave Sta (which receive very few immigrants from Europe) the incre of the whites during that decade was 24.67, that of the negr only 13.9 per cent, or little more than half the rate sho by the whites,[2] while in the eight black States mentio above the percentage of increase of the white populatio 29.63, that of the negroes only 19.10. It thus appears t except in certain parts of these eight States, where phys conditions favourable to the growth of the coloured po lation prevail, the whites increase everywhere faster than negroes, and the latter constitute a relatively decreasing ment.[3] This fact, though suspected previously, has been pla beyond doubt by the census of 1890. It is the dominating of the political and social situation.

[1] It was still greater in Arkansas (47.73 per cent), Florida (31.56 per c and Texas (25.28 per cent), but the negroes have been in these three S much less numerous than the whites, and the increase is probably largely to negro immigration from other States.

[2] Arkansas and Mississippi are the only States which show a greate crease of coloured than of white people; and in the former State, pos in the latter also, immigration accounts for part of the increase. I tak above figures from *Census Bulletin*, No. 48.

[3] That which specially tends to keep down the negro increase is the large mortality among the children.

Of the economic and industrial state of the whole seven llions it is hard to speak in general terms, so different are conditions which different parts of the country present. one point only are those conditions uniform. Everywhere, xe in the Border States and in the farthest South, in the es, both great and small, and in the rural districts, the oured population constitute the poorest and socially lowest atum, corresponding in this respect to the new immigrants the Northern States, although, as we shall presently observe, y are far more sharply and permanently divided than are se immigrants from the classes above them. They furnish e-tenths of the unskilled labour, and a still larger propor- n of the domestic and hotel labour. Some, though a com- atively small number, have found their way into the skilled ndicrafts, such as joinery and metal work; and many are w employed in the mines and iron foundries of South-eastern nnessee and Northern Alabama, where they receive wages metimes equal to those paid to the white workmen, and are en occasionally admitted to the same trade-unions.[1] In tex- factories they are deemed decidedly inferior to the whites; whirr of the machinery is said to daze them or to send em to sleep. On the other hand, they handle tobacco better an the whites, and practically monopolize this large industry. all the cities a great part of the small retail trade is in ir hands, as are also such occupations as those of barber, oe-black, street vendor of drinks or fruit, together with the mbler kinds of railway service. In the rural districts the nense majority are either hired labourers or tenants of all farms, the latter class becoming more numerous the ther south one goes into the hot and malarious regions, ere the white man is less disposed to work on his own land. these tenants many — and some are both active and thrifty cultivate upon a system of crop-sharing, like that of the *tayers* in France. Not a few have bought plots of land, l work it for themselves. Of those who farm either their n land or that for which they pay rent, an increasing num-

[1] I find it stated (1893) that in West Tennessee the average pay per day he skilled white labourer is $2.50, of the coloured $1.60: and conceive that may fairly represent the proportion in most trades, though perhaps less ining than in some others. A large employer of labour in Virginia assured n 1890 that he paid some of his negroes (iron-workers) as much as $4.50 day. He added that they worked along with the whites, and drank less.

ber are raising crops for the market, and steadily improvi
their condition. Others, however, are content with getti
from the soil enough food to keep their families; and this
more especially the case in the lower lands along the coa
where the population is almost wholly black, and little affect
by the influences either of commerce or of the white ra
In these hot lowlands the negro lives much as he lived on t
plantations in the old days, except that he works less, becau
a moderate amount of labour produces enough for his ba
subsistence. No railway comes near him. He sees no new
paper: he is scarcely at all in contact with any one above l
own condition. Thus there are places, the cities especial
where the negro is improving industrially, because he has
work hard and comes into constant relation with the white
and other places, where he need work very little, and whe
being left to his own resources, he is in danger of relapsi
into barbarism. These differences in his material progr
in different parts of the country must be constantly borne
mind when one attempts to form a picture of his prese
intellectual and moral state.

The phenomena he presents in this latter aspect are ab
lutely new in the annals of the world. History is a rec
of the progress towards civilization of races originally b
barous. But that progress has in all previous cases been sl
and gradual. In the case of the chief Asiatic and Europe
races, the earlier stages are lost in the mists of antiqui
Even the middle and later stages, as we gather them from
writings of the historians of antiquity and from the reco
of the Dark and Middle Ages, show an advance in wh
there is nothing sudden or abrupt, but rather a process
what may be called tentative development, the growth a
enlargement of the human mind resulting in and being acc
panied by a gradual improvement of political institutions a
of the arts and sciences. In this process there are no le
and bounds; and it is the work, not of any one race alone,
of the mingled rivalry and co-operation of several. Utte
dissimilar is the case of the African negro, caught up in a
whirled along with the swift movement of the American
mocracy. In it we have a singular juxtaposition of the m
primitive and the most recent, the most rudimentary and
most highly developed, types of culture. Not greater is

erval which separates the chipped flints of the Stone Age
om the Maxim gun of to-day. A body of savages is vio-
ntly carried across the ocean and set to work as slaves on
e plantations of masters who are three or four thousand
ars in advance of them in mental capacity and moral force.
ey are treated like horses or oxen, are kept at labour by the
h, are debarred from even the elements of education, have
more status before the law, no more share in the thought
the culture of their owner than the sheep which he shears.
ie children and grandchildren of those whom the slave-ship
ought to the plantation remain like their parents, save indeed
at they have learnt a new and highly developed tongue and
ve caught up so much of a new religion as comes to them
rough preachers of their own blood. Those who have house-
rk to do, or who live in the few and small towns, pick up
ne knowledge of white ways, and imitate them to the best of
eir power. But the great mass remain in their notions and
eir habits much what their ancestors were in the forests of
e Niger or the Congo. Suddenly, even more suddenly than
ey were torn from Africa, they find themselves, not only
ed, but made full citizens and active members of the most
pular government the world has seen, treated as fit to bear
equal part in ruling, not themselves only, but also their
ent masters. Rights which the agricultural labourers of
gland did not obtain till 1885 were in 1867 thrust upon
se children of nature, whose highest form of pleasure had
herto been to caper to the strains of a banjo.

This tremendous change arrested one set of influences that
re telling on the negro, and put another set in motion. The
ation of master and servant came to an end, and with it the
cipline of compulsory labour and a great part of such inter-
urse as there had been between the white and the black
es. Very soon the whites began to draw away from the
gro, who became less a friend in fact the more he was an
ual in theory. Presently the mixture of blood stopped, a
xture which had been doing something for the blacks in
vening their mass, — only slightly on the plantations, but to
ne extent in the towns and among the domestic servants, —
h persons of superior energy and talent. On the other
nd, there were immediately turned on the freedman a vol-
e of new forces which had scarcely affected him as a slave.

He had now to care for himself, in sickness and in healt
He might go where he would, and work as much or as little
he pleased. He had a vote to give, or to sell. Educatio
became accessible; and facilities for obtaining it were prompt
accorded to him, first by his Northern liberators, but soon
his old masters also. As he learned to read and to vote,
crowd of modern American ideas, political, social, religiou
and economic, poured in upon him through the newspaper
No such attempt has ever been made before to do for a race
one stroke what in other times and countries nature has spe
centuries in doing. Other races have desired freedom and
share in political power. They have had to strive, and the
efforts have braced and disciplined them. But these thin
were thrust upon the negro, who found himself embarrass
by boons he had not thought of demanding.

To understand how American ideas work in an African brai
and how American institutions are affecting African habits, o
must consider what are the character and gifts of the neg
himself.

He is by nature affectionate, docile, pliable, submissive, a
in these respects most unlike the Red Indian, whose consp
uous traits are pride and a certain dogged inflexibility. He
seldom cruel or vindictive, — which the Indian often is, — nor
he prone to violence, except when spurred by lust. His intel
gence is rather quick than solid; and though not wanting in
sort of shrewdness, he shows the childishness as well as the la
of self-control which belongs to the primitive peoples. A natu
highly impressionable, emotional, and unstable is in him app
priately accompanied by a love of music, while for art he has
unlike the Red Indian — no taste or turn whatever. Su
talent as he has runs to words; he learns languages easily a
writes and speaks fluently, but shows no capacity for abstra
thinking, for scientific inquiry, or for any kind of inventi
It is, however, not so conspicuously on the intellectual side th
his weakness lies, as in the sphere of will and action. Havi
neither foresight nor "roundsight," he is heedless and unthrif
easily elated and depressed, with little tenacity of purpose, a
but a feeble wish to better his condition. Sloth, like that in
which the negroes of the Antilles have sunk, cannot be genera
charged upon the American coloured man, partly perhaps
cause the climate is less enervating and nature less bountif

though not so steady a workman as is the white, he is less ublesome to his employers, because less disposed to strike. is by his toil that a large part of the cotton, rice, and sugar p of the South is now raised. But any one who knows the orious ryot or coolie of the East Indies is struck by the ference between a race on which ages of patient industry ve left their stamp and the volatile children of Africa.

Among the modes or avenues in and by which the influences white America are moulding the negro, five deserve to be cially noted, those of the schools, of the churches, of litera-e, of industry, and of business or social relations.

Looking merely at the figures, elementary education would m to have made extraordinary progress. In the former Slave tes there are now 52 per cent of the coloured population of ool age enrolled on the books of some school, the percentage white pupils to the white population of school age in the same tes being 67, and the percentage of enrolments to population r the whole United States 69.[1] In these States the coloured ple are 30.98 per cent of the total population, and the coloured ils 27.37 per cent of the total school enrolments. A smaller centage of them than of white children is, therefore, on the ks of the schools; but when it is remembered that thirty-years ago only an infinitesimally small percentage were at ool at all, and that in many States it was a penal offence to ch a negro to read, the progress made is remarkable. Be-en 1877 and 1889, while the white pupils in the common ools of the South increased 70 per cent, the coloured pupils reased 113 per cent. It must not, however, be concluded m these figures that nearly the whole of the coloured popu-on are growing up possessed even of the rudiments of edu-ion. The ratio of attendance to school enrolment is, indeed, ost as good for the negroes as for the whites (62.14 against 48), the negroes, both parents and children, having a desire instruction. But the school-terms are so short in most of Southern States — the average number of days' schooling he year for each pupil being only 100 for the South-eastern tes, and 95 for the South-western against 168 in the North-tern — that a large number of whites and a still larger num-of coloured children receive too little teaching to enable m to read and write with ease. Thus out of 4,759,040

[1] *Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1890–91.*

negroes in the old Slave States over ten years of age, 2,887,82 or nearly 61 per cent, are returned as illiterates.[1] That t amount of higher education — seminary, collegiate, or unive sity education — obtained by the negroes is not only absolute small, but incomparably smaller than that obtained by t whites, is no more than might be expected from the fact th they constitute the poorest part of the population. The tot number of institutions of this description was in 1891 as f lows:[2] —

Normal schools,	52, with	10,042 pupils.
Secondary schools,	47, with	11,837 pupils.
Universities and colleges,[3]	25, with	8396 pupils.
Schools of theology,	25, with	755 pupils.
Schools of law,	5, with	121 pupils.
Schools of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy,	5, with	306 pupils.
Schools for the deaf and dumb and the blind,	16, with	536 pupils.

These universities are, of course, on a comparatively hu ble scale, and most of them might rather be called seconda schools. To these figures I may add that the grants made the State governments to common schools — in the South it usually from the State treasury and not from local taxati that school funds are derived—are generally distributed equa to white and to coloured schools: a circumstance which appe the more creditable to the good feeling and wisdom of t ruling whites when it is remembered that since they hold nea all the property, they pay by far the larger part of the tax State and local. These funds, however, nearly all go to elem tary education, and the institutions which provide higher edu tion for the negro are quite unequal to the demands made up them. Swarms of applicants for admission have to be turn away from the already over-crowded existing upper and norm schools and colleges; and thus the supply of qualified teach for the coloured schools is greatly below the needs of the ca The total number is at present only 24,150, with 1,324,9 pupils to deal with. In the white schools, with 3,539,6

[1] Abstract of the census of 1890, Table 14.

The proportion of illiterates is highest in South Carolina (64.1 per ce Georgia (67.5), Alabama (69.1), and Louisiana (72.1); lowest in the Distri Columbia (35), and Oklahoma (39.2). The Territory of Oklahoma was n Slave State, but its negro population (only 2,290 over ten years of age) is v small, and consists of negroes who have recently arrived from the older So

[2] *Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1890-91*, p. 1962.

[3] Including preparatory and primary departments of universities.

ils, there are 79,062 teachers, a proportion (about 1 teacher 44 pupils) obviously much too low, and too low even if we w for the difference between enrolment and attendance. the proportion in the coloured schools is lower still (1 to , and the teachers themselves are less instructed. The need secondary and normal schools is, therefore, still urgent, ugh much has been and is being done by Northern benevo- e for this admirable purpose.[1] There is something pathetic he eagerness of the negroes, parents, young people, and dren, to obtain instruction. They seem to think that the t of it is what keeps them below the whites, just as in the s which broke out in South Carolina during Sherman's in- ion, the negro mob burnt a library at Columbia because, as y said, it was from the books that "the white folks got r sense." And they have a notion (which, to be sure, is confined to them) that it is the want of book-learning ch condemns the vast bulk of their race to live by manual or, and that, therefore, by acquiring such learning they themselves rise in the industrial scale.

n the days of slavery, religion was practically the only lizing influence which told upon the plantation hands. religion, like everything else that enters the mind, is con- oned by the mental state of the recipient. Among the roes, it took a highly emotional and sensational form, in ch there was little apprehension of doctrine and still less virtue, while physical excitement constantly passed into asy, hysterics, and the other phenomena which accompany t are called in America camp-meetings. This form it has erto generally retained. The evils have been palpable, but good has been greater than the evil; and one fears to con- ure what this vast mass of Africans might have been had uch influence been at work to soften and elevate them, to create a sort of tie between them and their masters. istianity, however, has been among the negroes as it often in the Dark Ages and as it is in some countries even to- widely divorced from morality. The negro preachers, the ural and generally the only leaders of their people, are

[1] Among the great benefactions whose income is applied for the education e coloured people special mention may be made of the Peabody Fund, the F. Slater Fund, and the Daniel Hand Fund, all of which seem to be very y administered. I find the total annual sum given by the North to nor- and collegiate education among the negroes estimated at a million dollars.

(doubtless with noble exceptions) by no means a model cla
while through the population at large religious belief and ev
religious fervour are found not incompatible with great laxi
in sexual relations and a proneness to petty thefts. Fort
nately, here also there is evidence of improvement. T
younger pastors are described as being more rarely lazy a
licentious than were those of the older generation; th
preaching appeals less to passion and more to reason. As
is only coloured preachers who reach negro congregations. t
importance of such an improvement can hardly be overes
mated.[1] There is, of course, an enormous difference betwe
the coloured churches in the cities, especially those of t
Border States, where one finds a comparatively educated cler
and laity, with ideas of decorum modelled on those of th
white neighbours, and the pure negro districts further sou
in some of which, as in parts of Louisiana, not merely have t
old superstitions been retained, but there has been a mark
relapse into the Obeah rites and serpent worship of Afric
heathendom. How far this has gone no one can say. Th
are parts of the lower Mississippi valley as little explored,
far as the mental and moral condition of the masses is co
cerned, as are the banks of the Congo and the Benué.

From what has been said of the state of education, it w
have been gathered that the influence of books is confined
extremely few, and that even of newspapers to a small fract
of the coloured people. Nevertheless, the significance of wh
ever forms the mind of that small fraction must not be und
estimated. The few thousands who read books or magazin

[1] Mr. Philip A. Bruce says (*Atlantic Monthly* for June, 1892, p. 732): "
improvement of the character of the negro preachers is even more impor
than the improvement of the character of negro teachers; but it is an end n
difficult to reach because the preachers cannot be submitted after admis
to an ordeal that tests their fitness for the positions to be filled."

Mr. Bruce's book, *The Plantation Negro as a Freeman* (1889), presen
striking, though perhaps too gloomy a picture, of the condition of the race

Dr. Curry, who knows the South thoroughly and has so admirably adm
tered the Slater Fund, says, "One of the chief drawbacks to civilization in
negro race is the exceeding difficulty of giving a predominant ethical chara
to his religion. In the Black Belt, religion and virtue are often considere
distinct and separable things. The moral element, good character, is elimin
from the essential ingredients of Christianity, and good citizenship, wom
ness, honesty, truth, chastity, cleanliness, trustworthiness are not alway
the essence of religious obligation. An intelligent, pious, courageous mini
is indispensable to any hopeful attempt to lift up the negro race." — *Atla
Monthly* for June, 1892, p. 732.

few tens of thousands who see a daily paper, acquire the
as and beliefs and aspirations of the normal white citizen,
ject of course to the inherent differences in race character
ady referred to. They are in a sense more American than
recent immigrants from Central Europe and from Italy,
are now a substantial element in the population of the
ddle and Western States. Within this small section of the
ured people are the natural leaders of the millions who have
yet attained to what may be called the democratic American
sciousness. And the number of those upon whom books
newspapers play, in whom democratic ideas stimulate dis-
tent with the present inferiority of their people, is steadily,
in some districts, rapidly increasing. The efforts of those
are best fitted to lead have been hitherto checked by the
ousy which the mass is apt to feel for those who rise to
minence; but this tendency may decline, and there will be
eason for surprise if men of eloquence and ambition are one
found to give voice to the sentiments of their brethren
Frederick Douglass did.[1]

he influence of industry is another name for the influence of
-help. As a slave, the negro was no doubt taught to give
dy, though unintelligent, labour; and this was probably a
forward from his condition in Africa. But labour all of it
formed under supervision, and none of it followed by any
antage to the labourer except relief from the lash, labour
se aim was to accomplish not the best possible but the least
would suffice, did nothing to raise the character or to train
intelligence. Every day's work that the negro has done
e he became a freedman has helped him. Most of the work is
gh work, whether on the land or in the cities, and is done for
wages. But the number of those who, either as owners or as
nt farmers, raise their own crops for the market, and of
e who are finding their way into skilled employments, is an
ays increasing number. I have seen it stated that in 1892
Southern negroes paid taxes on property valued at more
n $14,000,000, practically all of which has been acquired
e 1865. To raise crops for the market is an education in
ft, foresight, and business aptitude, as well as in agricul-

[1] I remember to have listened to a striking speech by a negro in Richmond
hich he appealed to the historic glories of the State of Virginia, and sought
use the audience by reminding them that they too were Virginians.

ture; to follow a skilled industry is to train the intelligenc as well as the hand, and the will as well as the intelligenc There is, unfortunately, very little provision for the instructio of the young negroes in any handicraft, and the need of mean for imparting it is even more urgent than is that of secondar schools. It is satisfactory to know that the necessity is begi ning to be recognized, and some effort made to provide indu trial training. Dr. W. T. Harris observes with perfect truth:-

"With better industrial habits there comes a better style of livin Though most of the negroes still live in rude cabins, no better than th huts which served them as slaves, they who own or rent land have begun erect decent houses, and furnish them with taste, while in the suburbs a city the negro tradesman has sometimes as neat a villa as the white like occupation, though generally obliged to inhabit the coloured quarter.

Against the industrial progress of the negro there must l set two depressing phenomena. One is the increase of insanit very marked during the last few decades, and probably attri utable to the increased facilities which freedom has given f obtaining liquor, and to the stress which independence ar education have imposed on the undeveloped brain of a bac ward race. The other, not unconnected with the former, the large amount of crime. Most of it is petty crime, chief thefts of hogs and poultry, but there are also a good mar crimes against women. Seventy per cent of the convicts Southern jails are negroes;[1] and though one must allow f the fact that they are the poorest part of the population ar that the law is probably more strictly enforced against the than against the whites, this is a proportion double that their numbers.[2] Even in the District of Columbia more th half the arrests are among the coloured people, though th are only one third of the inhabitants.

[1] The South is still far behind the North in matters of prison manageme Convicts, and sometimes white as well as coloured convicts, are in ma States hired out to private employers or companies for rough work, and v harshly treated.

[2] It must however be observed that in the rest of the Union (North Ea North Central and West), the proportion of prisoners in the jails is mu higher among the foreign born than in the population at large, doubtl because they are the poorest class. The foreign born are 20 per cent of population and constitute 37 per cent of the prisoners. The foreign born children of foreign parents, taken together, constitute 49 per cent of prisoners.

The most potent agency in the progress of the humbler and ore ignorant sections of a community has always been their tercourse with those who are more advanced. In the United ates it is by their social commixture with the native citizens at European immigrants become so quickly assimilated, the itish in two or three years, the Germans and Scandinavians eight or ten. But the pre-condition of such commixture is e absence of race repulsion and especially the possibility of termarriage. In the case of the American negro, the race pulsion exists, and fusion by intermarriage is deemed impos-ble. The day of his liberation was also the day when the ites began to shun intercourse with him, and when opinion gan to condemn, not merely regular marriage with a person colour, for that had been always forbidden, but even an icit union.

To understand the very peculiar phenomena which mark the lations of the two races, one must distinguish between the rthern and Southern States.

In the North there was before the war a marked aversion to e negro and a complete absence of social intercourse with n. The negroes were, of course, among the poorest and least ucated persons in the community. But the poorest white oked down upon them just as much as the richest; and in ny States they enjoyed no political rights. The sympathy t for them during the Civil War, the evidence of courage d capacity for discipline they gave as soldiers in the Federal my, and the disposition to protect them which the Republi-n party showed during the Reconstruction period, have modi-d this aversion; and they have now comparatively little to mplain of in the North. They are occasionally admitted to ne inferior political office, or even to a seat in a State legis-ure. The Women's Christian Temperance Union receives em as members, and so does the Grand Army of the Republic, ough they are grouped in distinct "posts." People some-nes take pleasure in going out of their way to compliment em. A few years ago, for instance, a coloured student s chosen by his companions at Harvard University to be "class orator" of the year; and I know of cases in which lawyers of a city have signed memorials recommending oloured barrister for appointment to an important Federal ce. Nevertheless, there is practically no social intermix-

ture of white and coloured people. Except on the Pacif coast, a negro never sits down to dinner with a white ma in a railway refreshment-room. You never encounter him at private party. He is not received in a hotel of the bett sort, no matter how rich he may be. He will probably refused a glass of soda water at a drug store. He is not shave in a place frequented by white men, not even by a barber his own colour. He worships in a church of his own. N native white woman would dream of receiving his addresse Nor does it make any difference that he is three parts or seve parts white, if the stain of colour can be still discerne Kindly condescension is the best he can look for, accompanie by equality of access to a business or profession. Social equa ity is utterly out of his reach.

In the South, on the other hand, the whites had before t war no sense of personal repulsion from the negro. The d mestic slave was in the closest relation with his master's famil Sometimes he was his master's trusted friend. The white chi grew up with the black child as its playmate. The legal i equality was so immense that familiarity was not felt to invol any disturbance of the attitude of command. With emancip tion there must needs come a change; but the change wou have come more gently, and left a better relation subsistin had it not been for the unhappy turn which things took in t Reconstruction period under the dominance of the negro vo The white people were then thoroughly frightened. Th thought that the aim of the North was to force them to adm not only the civic but the social equality of the freedmen, a they resolved, if one can apply the language of delibera purpose to what was rather an unconscious and uncontrollab impulse, to maintain the social inferiority of the negro as w as to exclude him from political power. They are accustom to say, and to believe, that they know him better and like h better than the Northern people do. That there is not amo the educated whites of the South any hostility to the race a race is true enough. The sons of the planters, and of t better class generally, have kindly recollections of their form slaves, and get on well with their negro servants and workme while among the elder freedmen there is still a loyal attac ment to the children of their former masters. The poor whit however, dislike the negroes, resent the slightest assumpti

equality on the part of the latter,[1] and show their hatred by olence, sometimes even by ferocity, when any disturbance ises or when a negro fugitive has to be pursued. Except so r as it is involved in domestic service, the servants in the outh being nearly all negroes, there is now little intercourse tween whites and blacks. In many States the law requires e railroad and even the horse-car companies to provide parate cars for the latter, though there are cities, such as altimore and Washington, where the same horse-cars are ed by both races. In most parts of the South a person colour cannot enter a public refreshment-room used the whites except as the servant of a white; and one ay see the most respectable and, possibly, even educated loured woman, perhaps almost white, forced into the coloured r among rough negroes, while the black nurse in charge a white child is admitted to the white car. The two races e everywhere taught in distinct schools and colleges, though one or two places negroes have been allowed to study in the edical or law classes. They worship in different churches. hough they read the ordinary papers, they also support stinct organs for coloured men. They have distinct Young ens' Christian Associations. With some exceptions in the se of unskilled trades, they are not admitted to trade unions.[2] concert halls and theatres, if the coloured are admitted all, it is to an inferior part of the chamber. On the other nd, negroes are sometimes called to serve on juries, and civil stice seems to be administered quite fairly as between them d the whites.

Intermarriage is, in every State, forbidden by law, and, so as a traveller can ascertain, very few children from parents different bloods are now born.[3] And it must, I fear, be ded that in some parts of the South a white man would run le more risk of being hanged for the murder of a negro than Mussulman in Turkey for the murder of a Christian.

Under so complete a system of separation, it is clear that the luence of social intercourse between whites and blacks, an

[1] A Virginian observed to me, "Our whites don't molest the negroes so long he negroes don't presume!"

[2] Their unions are however admitted to the federation of the Knights of bour.

[3] Mr. Brackett (*Progress of the Coloured People of Maryland*) notes inces of convictions and imprisonments under this law in Maryland.

influence to which the domestic slaves before the war ow
much, now counts for little. But the question of the attitu
of the whites has another side. It means more than the s
pension of a civilizing agency. There is evidence to show tl
the coloured generation which has grown up since the w
and which has been in less close touch with the white peo
than were the slaves and freedmen of the last generation,
much less friendly to them. It has lost the instinctive se
of subservience and dependence, and its more educated me
bers feel acutely the contrast between their legal equality a
their inequality in every other respect. The whites perce
this; and the lower class among them become still m
suspicious and violent. In this situation there lie possibilit
of danger. The strained relations of the races appear most f
quently in the lynchings of negroes so often reported from
South. It is extremely hard to ascertain the truth of
reports regarding these lawless acts, for the newspapers of
invent horrors, and there is little judicial investigation ma
into those whose reality is undeniable. I cannot vouch
the statement which I have read, that in 1892 241 lynchi
took place in the United States, 200 of which were in
South; and that of the persons put to death 161 were negr
and 80 whites.[1] As might be expected, many exaggerati
appear and obtain credence in Europe as well as sometim
in the North. But there can be no doubt that over the Sou
and, to a much smaller extent, in the North also, negr
accused of assassinating white men, or of outraging wh
women or children are frequently seized by white mobs a
summarily killed; that occasionally, though probably not oft
an innocent man perishes, and that the killing is sometim
accompanied by circumstances of revolting cruelty. Now a
then the culprit is burned alive. Often his body, after
has been hanged, is riddled with bullets, a piece of barbar
akin to the Eastern habit of mutilating the corpses of the sl
The excuses offered for these acts are that white women, es
cially in sparsely inhabited regions, are in considerable dan
from the lust of brutal negroes, and that the swift appreh

[1] The Census Bulletin on Homicide (No. 182) states that the county she
reported 117 lynchings during the year 1889, of which 94 were in the So
Oddly enough this was exactly the number of executions reported from
South. These reports, however, are believed to be incomplete.

on and slaughter of the culprit not only strikes greater dread
an the regular process of justice, but does not gratify the
gro's enjoyment of the pomp and ceremony of a formal trial
fore a judge. It is also declared, and with truth, that whites
so are lynched, though not so frequently and in a less atro-
ous way,[1] that the negroes themselves occasionally lynch a
gro, that it is hard for the executive authority, with no force
cept the militia at its command, to protect prisoners and
press disorder, and that the lynchings are the work of a com-
ratively small and rude part of the white population; the
tter citizens disapproving, but with American nonchalance
clining to interfere.

Whatever palliations may be found in these circumstances,
and it is quite true that in a thinly peopled and unpoliced
untry white women do stand in serious risk,—there can
no doubt that the practice of lynching has a pernicious
ect on the whites themselves, accustoming them to cruelty,
d fostering a spirit of lawlessness which tells for evil on
ery branch of government and public life. Were the ne-
oes less cowed by the superior strength and numbers of
e whites, reprisals, now rare, would be more frequent. Yet
en in a race with so little vindictiveness of temper, terri-
mischief is done. The tendency to accept the leadership
the whites, and to seek progress rather by industrial and
ucational than by political efforts is damped, and the estab-
ument of good feeling and a sense of public security is
arded. The humble negro shuns contact with the whites,
knowing when some band of roughs may mishandle him;
d sometimes a lynching is followed by a sudden rush of
oured emigration from the State or district where it has
opened.[2] The educated and aspiring negro resents the sav-
spirit shown towards his colour, though he feels his help-
sness too keenly to attempt any action which could check it.
This social repulsion and its consequences present a painful

[1] There was, however, an instance two or three years ago, in which the party
ch was hunting for a white murderer announced their intention of burn-
him. I do not know whether he was caught. I have even read in the
spapers of a case in which a crowd allowed two women to flog a third to
h, but this was in a wild mountain region. All the parties were whites.

[2] Not long ago the negroes flocked into the new Territory of Oklahoma,
ng to obtain better security for themselves by their presence in consider-
numbers.

contrast to the effect of the four previous influences we hav
examined. As respects their intelligence, their character, thei
habits of industry, the coloured people are making distinct
not rapid progress. It is a progress very unequal as regard
the different regions of the country, and perhaps may no
extend to some districts of the so-called Black Belt, whic
stretches from the coast of South Carolina across the Gul
States. It is most evident in the matter of education, less ev
dent as respects religion and the influence of literature. It
economic results are perceptible in the accumulation of prop
erty by city workmen, in the acquisition of small farms by rura
cultivators, in the slow, but steady, increase in the number o
coloured people in the professions of medicine, law, and litera
ture. Were it accompanied by a growth of good feeling be
tween whites and negroes, and a more natural and friendl
intercourse between them in business and in social matters
the horizon would be bright, and the political difficulties
which I shall presently describe, need not cause alarm. Thi
intercourse is, however, conspicuously absent. The progres
of the coloured people has been accompanied by the evolutio
of social classes within their own body. Wealthy and edu
cated negroes, such as one may now find in cities like Balt
more, Louisville, Richmond, Atlanta, and New Orleans, hav
come to form a cultured group, who are looked up to by th
poorer class.[1] But these cultured groups are as little in co
tact with their white neighbours as are the humblest coloure
labourers, perhaps even less so. No prospect is open to them
whatever wealth or culture they may acquire, of finding a
entrance into white society, and they are made to feel in
thousand ways that they belong to a caste condemned to pe
petual inferiority. Their spokesmen in the press have la
terly so fully realized the position as to declare that they d
not seek social equality with the whites, that they are qui

[1] The mulattoes or quadroons are, as a rule, more advanced than the pu
blacks, and generally avoid intermarriage with the latter. Now and the
however, a pure black may be found of remarkable intelligence. Such a on
a Louisiana farmer who read, and talked with sense and judgment about, t
Greek philosophers, is described in the graphic and instructive sketches call
Studies in the South. — *Atlantic Monthly*, for February, 1882. At the Ham
ton Normal Institute, the school so admirably worked by a devoted friend
the negro the late Gen. S. C. Armstrong, the award of honours showed th
the mixed blood was not so intellectually superior to the full black as h
been generally supposed.

lling to build up a separate society of their own, and ek neither intermarriage nor social intercourse, but that nat they do ask is equal opportunity in business, the profes- ons, and politics, equal recognition of the worth of their anhood, and a discontinuance of the social humiliations they e now compelled to endure.[1]

From this attempt to sketch the phenomena of the present, proceed to consider the future. The future has two problems solve. One is political; the other social. How is the termination of the whites to rule to be reconciled with the ssession by the negroes of equal rights of suffrage? How n the social severance or antagonism of the two races, — by nichever term we are to describe it, — the haughty asser- n of superiority by the whites and the suppressed resent- nt of the more advanced among the coloured people, be evented from ripening into a settled distrust and hostility nich may affect the peace and prosperity of the South for nturies to come?

The methods whereby the negroes have been prevented om exercising the rights of suffrage vested in them by law ve been described in the last preceding chapter. These eans are now seldom violent; but whether violent or pacific, ey have been almost uniformly successful. In the so-called rder States, the whites are in so great a majority that they not care to interfere with the coloured vote, except now d then by the use of money. Through the rest of the South e negro has come to realize that he will not be permitted to ercise any influence on the government; and his interest in ning to the polls has therefore declined. This is true of all ts of elections, just as the determination of the whites to press his vote is no less strong as respects Federal elec- ns, whose result cannot directly affect the administration of ate or local affairs, or the imposition of State or local taxes, an it is in State and local elections. I have already ex- ined that, although contempt for the negro as a citizen has ne share in this determination, its main cause is the alarm generally felt by the whites at the possibility of negro dom- tion. A stranger, whether from the North or from Europe, lines to think this alarm groundless. He perceives that the

[1] See an interesting article by a distinguished coloured clergyman (since eased), Dr. J. C. Price, in the *Forum*, for January, 1891.

whites have not only the habit of command, but also near all the property, the intelligence, and the force of charact which exist in the country. He reminds his Southern hos that the balance even of numbers is inclining more and mo in their favour; and that the probability of Northern interve tion on behalf of the excluded negro voter has become, sin the failure of the Federal Elections Bill of 1890, extreme slight, while the other conditions of 1867 can never recur. O this point, however, the Southern man is immovable. To hi it is a simple question of self-preservation. "We like th negro," said a leader among them to me some years ago; "w know he must stay; we desire to treat him well. But if h votes, we must outvote him."

The results are in every way unfortunate. The negroe naturally docile and disposed to follow the lead of their whi employer or neighbour, feel themselves suspected, and li in a terror of being stripped of the civic rights which they a not suffered to exercise, like the terror which for a time po sessed them of being thrown back into slavery. So far they vote at all they mostly cling together, and vote soli intimidating or boycotting any one of their number who supposed to be a "bolter." The whites, accustomed to justi their use of force or fraud by the plea of necessity, ha become callous to electoral malpractices. The level of puri and honesty in political methods, once comparatively hig has declined; and the average Southern conscience is no little more sensitive than is that of professional politicians Northern cities. Nor is the mischief confined to election The existence of this alarm has, by making the negro questi the capital question in national as well as State politi warped the natural growth of political opinion and politi parties upon all those other current questions which enga the mind of the people, and has to that extent retarded the reabsorption into the general political life of the Republic.

Sensible Southern men feel the evils of the present state things, and seek anxiously for an escape from them. Out the many remedies that have been proposed, three deserve be specially noticed.

The first is (as proposed in the bill of 1890) to give p tection to the coloured voter by the action of Federal office backed by Federal troops. This could, of course, be do

der the Constitution at Federal elections only, and would cover the equally important State and local elections. It uld, moreover (as the discussions of 1890 showed), provoke eat exasperation at the South, and might lead to breaches the peace, from which the negroes would be the chief suf-ers. The whole South would resist it, and no small part of e Northern people would dislike it.

A second remedy is to repeal the Fifteenth Amendment to e Federal Constitution, and leave each State free to exclude groes from the suffrage. This plan, although sometimes put ward by men of ability, is even more impracticable than e preceding one. A majority of three-fourths of the States uld not be secured for the repeal of a provision which the rthern people value as sealing one of the main results of Civil War. Nor would the Southern States themselves, h their Democratic allies at the North, favour a change ich would, in disfranchising their negroes, largely reduce nder the Fourteenth Amendment) their present vote at esidential and Congressional elections. To repeal the Four-nth Amendment and allow a State to be represented in portion not to its voters but to its population, is, of course, of the question. It may, therefore, be assumed that no ious attempt will be made to set up colour as a legal ground discrimination.

The third suggested scheme is to limit the suffrage by some ucational or even some pecuniary qualification — although erican sentiment dislikes a property qualification — which l, in fact, exclude many or most of the negroes, not as roes, but because they are ignorant or poor. Such a scheme proposed by Gen. Wade Hampton in South Carolina as far k as 1867, but has never yet been tried except in Missis-pi, where the Constitution of 1890[1] provides that a person lying to be registered as a voter "shall be able to read any tion of the Constitution, or be able to understand the same en read to him, or to give a reasonable interpretation thereof." The advantages of such a method are obvious, and have gested its adoption in a British colony where the presence a large coloured population has raised a problem not dis-

[1] There was one negro member in the Convention that enacted this Consti-on, which was never (be it noted) submitted to the popular vote. See Vol. 433 and p. 485.

similar to that we have been examining.[1] Recognizing t need of knowledge and intelligence for the due exercise political power, it excludes a large mass of confessedly inco petent persons, while leaving the door open for those negro whose instructed capacity brings them up to the level of t bulk of the whites, and who, in some places, may be now fro one-fourth to one-third of the whole negro population. Th it may operate, not only as an improvement in the electo body, but as an incentive to educational progress.

The obstacles to the adoption of the plan have, howev been serious. One is that in disfranchising their negroes f want of education, most Southern States would have also disfranchise no trifling part of their white population, th namely, which is below any educational standard high enou to exclude the mass of negroes. The percentage of illiterat to the whole population over ten years of age is in the Sou eastern States 14.5 and in the South-western 15.[2] To expe these voters (about 1,412,000) to disfranchise themselves the sake of excluding negroes is to expect too much. T other is that every limitation of the suffrage diminishes *pro tanto* (Amendment XIV.) a State's representation in Fede elections, thereby weakening its influence in Federal affa and mortifying its self-esteem. The State of Mississippi, wh courageously facing the latter of these difficulties, so far as t coloured people are concerned, has sought to evade the form by the ingenious loophole under which the registering offici may admit whites who, though illiterate, are able to give "reasonable interpretation" of any section of the Consti tion. Such whites have, one is told, been able to satisfy t officials far more generally than have the negroes. And this particular section happens to be put to them, their co mon sense will find its interpretation obvious.

Of the three plans suggested, that which would reduce negro vote by the imposition of an educational test w appear to the dispassionate observer the safest and the f

[1] In Cape Colony the Franchise and Ballot Act of 1892 raises the (pr ously very low) property qualification for the suffrage, and provides (that no person shall be registered as an elector "unless he is able to sign name and write his address and occupation." These provisions disqua the great bulk of the native coloured people, few of whom have, as ma supposed, any interest in politics.

[2] Abstract of the census of 1890. Table 14.

. It casts no slur upon the negro race as a race, and
es not wear the aspect of a retrogression from the gen-
sity with which the suffrage was bestowed. It conforms
a principle reasonable in itself, and already adopted by
ne Northern States. If applied as it ought to be, honestly
both races alike, it would in most Southern States exclude
ugh negroes to dispel apprehensions of any revolt against
ite government; and it would remove the occasion or ex-
e for that habit of tampering with elections which is not
rely a scandal, but a grave danger to the political life of
South. There is, however, — although some such plan has
n discussed in Louisiana, — no great present prospect that
ion on these lines will be taken in other States. The South
istless and slow to change. Parts of it are distracted by the
d between the old Democrats and the Farmers' Alliance or
pulist party. The problem does not strike the average citi-
as urgent; nor is it urgent, in the sense that some solution
st be found before a given date. The habit of breaking or
ding the law unhappily perpetuates itself by accustoming
ple to think it venial. The most probable forecast is
t the present system will continue for some time to come,
negroes growing less and less interested in their right
suffrage, and the whites by degrees losing the apprehen-
ns that now fill their minds, until at last a new generation
es that remembers not the days of Reconstruction. Some
stion may then appear which so divides the whites that
h parties will see their advantage in capturing the negro
e.[1] Each party will try to win it over, and each will get a
re of it. It may then, having lost its present solidarity,
absorbed into the vote of the white parties, whatever they
n are; and though it will still be comparatively unin-
ucted and perhaps largely venal, the forcible or fraudulent
pression of the last twenty years, with the evils thence
ing, will have passed away.

Even graver than the political difficulties which have been
cribed is the social problem raised by the coexistence on the
ne soil, under the same free government, of two races so
ely differing that they do not intermingle. Social disparity
ocial oppression cuts deeper than any political severance;

[1] Occasionally even now an effort is made to attract the negro vote. I have
it stated that the "Populists" recently tried to do so in Georgia.

and time, so far from curing the mischief, seems during t last thirty or forty years to have aggravated it. Politics lea untouched large parts of the field of human life, even in t United States; and the political inferiority of the colour race, since it is the result of their retarded intellectual develo ment, seems in accord with nature. Social inferiority, whi is felt at every moment, and which jars on the sense of hum brotherhood, is a more serious matter.

This problem is, moreover, a new one in history, for t relations of the ruling and subject races of Europe and A supply no parallel to it. Whoever examines the records the past, will find that the continued juxtaposition of two ra has always been followed either by the disappearance of t weaker, or by the intermixture of the two. Where race ant onisms still remain, as in parts of Eastern Europe, and on a larger scale in Asia, one may expect a similar solution to ultimately reached. In Transylvania, for instance, Saxo Magyars, and Roumans stand apart from one another, the t latter mutually suspicious and politically hostile. So furth east one finds strong religious antagonisms (not without se ous attendant evils), such as those of Sunnis, Shiahs, a Christians in Western Asia, or of Hindus and Mussulmans India, antagonisms, however, which only partially coinci with race differences, and have thrown the latter quite i the shade. In all such cases, however, though one race religion may be for the moment dominant, there is no nec sary or permanent distinction between them; and there if the religious difficulty can be overcome, a possibility intermarriage. Other cases may be suggested where a fusi is improbable, as between the British and the natives in Ind or the colonists and the natives in New Zealand. But European rulers of India are a mere handful in comparis with the natives, nor do they settle in India so as to for part of its permanent population; while as to New Zeala the Maoris, a diminishing body, live apart on their own lan and form a community likely, while it survives, to conti distinct. In Western South America the Spanish settl have, to some extent, mingled their blood with that of native Indians, and may ultimately become as much blent w the latter as has befallen in Mexico. The peculiar feat of the race problem as it presents itself in the United Sta

hat the negroes are in many districts one-third or even one- of the population, are forced to live in the closest local iguity with the whites, and are for the purposes of indus- indispensable to the latter, yet are so sharply cut off from whites by colour and all that colour means, that not merely ingling of blood, but any social approximation, is regarded n horror, and perpetual severance is deemed a law of ure.

rom such a position what issue? One hears little said in erica of any possible issue, partly because the nation is d of the whole subject, which has, in one form or another, racted it for more than seventy years, partly because every n that has been suggested is open to patent objections. eral, however, may deserve to be mentioned.

ven long before the war, and often since, it has been pro- ed that the negroes should be retransported to Africa. petty and stagnant Republic of Liberia owes its origin he idea that it might furnish a home for Afro-American dmen, and a centre whence they might be dispersed in er and larger numbers through their ancient home. But r seventy-three years the population of Liberia of American in is only some 18,000, the million of other inhabitants g aborigines, and the unpaid interest on a national debt 100,000 amounts to £133,000.

here are two fatal objections to the plan of exporting the hern negroes to Africa. One is that they will not go; the r that the whites cannot afford to let them go. There is ing to attract them in the prospect of being uprooted from r homes in a country where the comforts of civilization attainable by industry, and thrown upon a new shore, dy occupied by savages of whose very languages, except ne few spots where English is spoken, they are ignorant.[1] Southern whites, so far from encouraging, would resist departure; for it would mean the loss of the labour hich more than half the crops of the South are raised, great part of her mining and iron-working industries ed on. Much of the country, as too hot for European ur, would remain untilled and useless were the negro

[1] variation of this suggestion has been that while the pure blacks should ported to Africa, the (usually more advanced) mulattoes and quadroons go to reclaim the Antilles. See *An Appeal to Pharaoh;* New York, 1890.

to disappear; for of the introduction of coolie labour fr India there can be no talk in a nation which has so stric forbidden the entrance of Chinese. The negro, in short, essential to the material prosperity of the South, and departure would mean ruin to it. Even now, the Atlan States do what they can to prevent their coloured labour from leaving them to go west.[1]

Apart from these obstacles, the transferrence of more th seven millions of people from one continent to another hardly within the horizon of the possible. Their annual crease will soon approach 200,000, quite as large a number could be, in a single year, conveyed to and provided for Africa. How many emigrant ships, and at what cost, wo be needed even for this, not to speak of the far larger exper needed to keep them from starving till they had begun to s ter themselves through the interior of Africa! To proc by transporting these 200,000 a year, would be to try to em a running stream by a ladle. The notion of such a solut has been abandoned by nearly all sensible men in Amer though here and there a belated voice repeats it.

Far easier is the alternative plan of setting apart for coloured people certain districts of the country, such as instance the southern part of the Atlantic coast region the lowlands of the Gulf, and moving them into these tricts from the rest of the country, as Oliver Cromwell dr the wild Irish into Connaught. But neither does this solut find any favour in America. No State would consent to even a part of its territory cut off and allotted to the negr to be by them administered in their own way. The rest of country would hardly admit a purely black State to be re sented in Congress and to vote in Presidential elections equal terms. And in many parts of the South, which better suited for whites than for negroes, and in which, th fore, the white population is now much larger, the leading in tries would suffer severely from the removal of negro lab Northern Alabama, for instance, is in point of climate a reg well fitted for whites. But the iron works there employ g numbers of negroes who are found most efficient, and wh

[1] North Carolina has, I believe, a statute which punishes with a fi $1000 any one entering the State for the purpose of endeavouring to the negroes to States further west.

ce might not be easily filled. Virginia is, in the main, a white te. But not only the growing of tobacco, but also its prep- ion for the market, is a negro industry; and it would be simple matter to find white work-people to do it equally l and cheaply. This scheme, therefore, may also be dis- sed as outside the range of practical politics.

There remains the suggestion that the method by which race agonisms have been so often removed in the past in the World, and to some extent (as, for instance, in Mexico) in New World also, may eventually be applied in the United tes; that is to say, that the two races may be blent by in- marriage into one. To many Europeans, and to a very few rivors of the Abolitionist party in the North, this solution ears possible and even natural. To all Southern sentiment s shocking. I have never met a Southern man, whether n there or an incomer from the North, who would even dis- s the possibility of such a general commixture of whites and ks as Brazil has begun to show. In no Southern State such a marriage be legally contracted; and what is more arkable, in every Southern State such unions are exces- ly rare. The percentage of children born from a white a coloured parent (reckoning mulattoes and quadroons as ured) is not, and hardly can be, ascertained, but it must be emely small; much less than one per cent of the total number irths. Even at the North, where the aversion to negro blood ow less strong, "miscegenation," as they call it, is deemed a disgrace to the white who contracts it that one scarcely s of its occurrence. Enlightened Southern men, who have nselves no dislike to the black race, justify this horror of rmarriage by arguing that no benefit which might thereby ue to the negroes could balance the evil which would befall rest of the community. The interests of the nation and of anity itself would, in their view, suffer by such a permanent sement of the Anglo-American race as would follow. Our lish blood is suffering enough already, they say, from the usion of inferior stock from Continental Europe; and we ld be brought down to the level of Mexico or Brazil were we ave an infusion from Africa added. This is the argument hich reason appeals. That enormous majority which does reason is swayed by a feeling so strong and universal that e seems no chance of its abating within any assignable

time. Revolutions in sentiment are, no doubt, conceivable, they are more rare than revolutions in politics.

We arrive, therefore, at three conclusions.

I. The negro will stay in North America.

II. He will stay locally intermixed with the white po lation.

III. He will stay socially distinct, as an alien eleme unabsorbed and unabsorbable.

His position may, however, change from what it is n Two changes in particular seem probable.

He will more and more draw southwards into the lower hotter regions along the coasts of the Atlantic and the Gul Mexico. Whether in the more northerly States, such as Ma land and Missouri, he will decrease, may be doubtful. it is certainly in those southerly regions that his chief fut increase may be expected. In other words, he will be a r tively smaller, and probably much smaller, element than present in the whole population north of latitude 36°, an relatively larger one south of latitude 33°, and east of lo tude 94° W.

This change will have both its good and its evil side. It involve less frequent occasions for collision between the races, and may dispose the negroes, where they are comp tively few, to acquiesce less reluctantly in white predomina But it will afford scantier opportunities for the gradual el tion of the race in the districts where they are most numer Contact with the whites is the chief condition for the prog of the negro. Where he is isolated, or where he greatly numbers the whites, his advance will be retarded, altho nothing has yet occurred to justify the fear that he will, along the Gulf coast, or in the sea islands of Carolina, sin the level of the Haytian.

This first change will be the result of physical causes. second change will be due to intellectual and social i ences. The negroes will doubtless, taking them over the w country, though more rapidly in some regions than in ot advance in education, intelligence, and wealth, as well a habits of thrift and application. Their progress since war enables one to predict this with confidence. Such prog may seem an unmixed good. Yet it can hardly fail t accompanied by a growing discontent with the social

ties imposed upon them. It will give them greater capacity
organization, possibly greater tenacity and courage, than
y now possess; and these very things may, by alarming the
ites, tend to widen the chasm between the races. Whether
coloured people will be much better able to give effect to the
entment they feel, may be doubted, so great is the disparity
strength. But they may be more embittered, and this em-
erment, reacting upon white sentiment, may retard the
rking of those healing influences which the progress of
lization generally brings in its train. Already one hears
younger whites of the South talk of the growing "uppish-
s" and impertinence of the negro, as things to be resented
punished.

That sense of haughty superiority which other nations note in
English has in their Indian dominions done much to de-
by the happy effects of the enormous social and economic
provements which the rule of Britain has effected. A
ng indigo planter, or a lieutenant only just released from
ool at home, will treat with wanton insolence or contumely
ives of the highest caste, perhaps of dignified social position
ancient lineage; and though Government punishes these
nces in the rare cases when they are brought to its know-
ge, the sentiment of Anglo-Indian society scarcely condemns
m. Thus the very classes whom rank and education might
e been expected to render loyal to British authority are
nated. When similar tendencies appear in the Anglo-
erican of the South, the Englishman, who knows how not
ew of his own countrymen behave to the ancient and culti-
ed races of the East whom they have conquered, feels that
is not entitled to sit in judgment.

do not suggest that there is any present political danger
the Republic, or even to any particular Southern State,
n the phenomena here described. But the evil of these
ngs is to be measured not merely by any such menace to
tical stability as they may involve, but also by the diminu-
of happiness which they cause, by the passions hurtful to
al progress they perpetuate, by the spirit of lawlessness
y evoke, by the contempt for the rights of man as man
ch they engender. In a world already so full of strife
sorrow it is grievous to see added to the other fountains
bitterness a scorn of the strong for the weak, and a dread

by the weak of the strong, grounded on no antagonism of int
ests, for each needs the other, but solely on a difference in r
and colour.

Be these evils what they may — and serious as they seem
an observer from without, they are in most parts of the So
not keenly felt — legislation and administration can do compa
tively little to remove them. It is, indeed, to be wished t
lynching should be sternly repressed, — some of the South
State governors are doing what they can for that purpose,
and that the State statutes or local regulations enforc
separation of blacks from whites in travelling or in places
public resort should be repealed. But the real change
which the friends of the South and of the negro look forw
is a change in the feelings of the white people, and especia
of the ruder and less educated part of them. The polit
troubles I have described will probably pass away un
altered political conditions — one can already see how
may happen within the next fifty years. For the social d
culty, rooted deep in the characters of the two races, none
moral remedies have any promise of potency, and the work
of moral remedies, sure as we believe it to be, is alw
slow. Neither will compulsive measures quicken that w
ing. In the United States, above all other countries,
must place one's hopes on the *vis medicatrix naturæ*,
trust that the forces which make not only for equal
but also for peace and good-will among men, will in
time reduce these evils, as they have reduced many oth
There is no ground for despondency to any one who rem
bers how hopeless the extinction of slavery seemed s
or even forty years ago, and who marks the progress wh
the negroes have made since their sudden liberation.
less is there reason for impatience, for questions like
have in some countries of the Old World required ages
their solution. The problem which confronts the South is
of the great secular problems of the world, presented here u
a form of peculiar difficulty. And as the present differe
between the African and the European are the produc
thousands of years, during which one race was advancin
the temperate, and the other remaining stationary in
torrid zone, so centuries may pass before their relation
neighbours and fellow-citizens have been duly adjusted.

CHAPTER XCIV

FOREIGN POLICY AND TERRITORIAL EXTENSION

So far I have had to say nothing, and now I need say but ttle, of a subject which would have been constantly obtrud- ig itself had we been dealing with any country in Europe. o every country in Europe foreign relations are a matter of rimary importance. The six Great Powers of that continent re all in more or less danger from one another, obliged to pro- ect themselves by armies, fleets, and alliances. Great Britain, eeking no extension of territory and comparatively safe from ttack at home, has many colonies and one vast dependency to rotect, and is drawn by them, far more than by her European osition, into the tangled web of Old World diplomacy. To l these Powers, and not less to the minor ones, the friendly hostile attitude of the others is matter of vital consequence. ot only, therefore, must immense sums be spent on warlike reparations, but a great establishment of officials must be aintained and no small part of the attention of the Adminis- ation and the legislature be given to the conduct of the inter- tional relations of the State. These relations, moreover, nstantly affect the internal politics of the country; they metimes cause the triumph or the defeat of a party; they fluence financial policy; they make or mar the careers of atesmen.

In the United States, nothing of the kind. Since the Mexi- n war of 1845, external relations have very rarely, and then ly to a slight extent, affected internal political strife. They not lie within the sphere of party platforms or party action. ey do not occupy the public mind. We have hitherto found occasion to refer to them save in describing the functions the Senate; and I mention them now as the traveller did e snakes in Iceland, only to note their absence, and to indi- te some of the results ascribable thereto.

Though the chief and obvious cause of this striking contras between the great Western Republic and the Powers of Europ is to be found in her geographical position on a continent where since she bought out France and Spain, she has had only tw neighbours, one hopelessly weak on the south and one natu rally friendly on the north, much must also be set down t the temper and convictions of the people. They are, and hav always been, pacific in their views, for the unjustifiable, becaus needless, war with Mexico was the work of the slave-holdin oligarchy and opposed to the general sentiment of the people They have no lust of conquest, possessing already as muc land as they want. They have always been extremely jealou of a standing army, the necessary support of ambitious foreig policies. They have been so much absorbed by and intereste in the development of their material resources as to care ver little for what goes on in other countries. As there is no mil tary class, so also there is no class which feels itself called o to be concerned with foreign affairs, and least of all is such class to be found among the politicians. Even leading state men are often strangely ignorant of European diplomacy, muc more the average senator or congressman. And into the min of the whole people there has sunk deep the idea that all suc matters belong to the bad order of the Old World; and tha the true way for the model Republic to influence that world i to avoid its errors, and set an example of pacific industrialism

This view of the facts may appear strange to those who re member that the area of the United States, which in 1783 wa about one million square miles, is now something over thre and a half millions. All this added territory, however, excep the cessions made by Mexico in 1847, came peaceably by wa of purchase or (in the case of Texas) voluntary union; and a (with the possible exception of Alaska) consists of regio which naturally cohere with the original Republic, and ough to be united with it. The limits of what may be called natur expansion have now (subject to what will be said presently been reached; and the desire for annexation is probably feebl than at any preceding epoch, while the interest in foreign rel tions generally has not increased. For a time a sort of frien ship was professed for Russia, more for the sake of teasin England than from any real sympathy with a despotic mo

rchy very alien to the American spirit. But at present abso-
ute neutrality and impartiality as regards the Old World is
bserved; and a remarkable proof of the desire to abstain from
ngagements affecting it was recently given, when the United
States Government declined to ratify the International Act of
he Berlin Conference of 1885 regulating the Congo Free State,
lthough its minister at Berlin had taken part in the delibera-
ions of the Conference by which that Act was prepared. And
t was after much delay and some hesitation that they ratified
in 1892) even the Brussels International Slave Trade Act.

Such abstinence from Old World affairs is the complement to
hat claim of a right to prevent any European power from
ttempting to obtain a controlling influence in New World
ffairs which goes by the name of the Monroe Doctrine, from
he assertion of it by President Monroe in his Message of 1823.

The notion that the United States ought to include at least
ll the English and French speaking communities of North
merica is an old one. Repeated efforts were made before and
uring the War of Independence to induce Canada, Nova Scotia,
nd even the Bermuda Islands to join the revolted colonies.
or many years afterwards the view continued to be expressed
hat no durable peace with Great Britain could exist so long
s she retained possessions on the North American continent.
When by degrees that belief died away, the eyes of ambi-
ous statesmen turned to the South. The slave-holding party
ought to acquire Cuba and Porto Rico, hoping to turn them
nto slave States; and President Polk even tried to buy Cuba
om Spain. After the abolition of slavery, attempts were
ade under President Johnson in 1867 to acquire St. Thomas
nd St. John's from Denmark, and by President Grant (1869–
3) to acquire San Domingo, — an independent republic, — but
he Senate frustrated both.

None the less does the idea that the United States is entitled
forbid any new establishment by any European power on its
vn continent, still survive, and indeed constitute the one fixed
rinciple of foreign policy which every party and indeed every
atesman professes. It is less needed now than it was in
onroe's day, because the United States have grown so im-
ensely in strength that no European power can constitute a
nger to them. Nevertheless, it was asserted in 1865, and led

to Louis Napoleon's abandonment of his Mexican schemes. It would have been asserted had the Panama Canal been completed. It is at the basis of the claim occasionally put forward made to control the projected Nicaragua inter-oceanic canal and is supported by the argument that a water-way between the Atlantic and the Pacific is of far more consequence, not only in a commercial but in a military sense, to the United States than to any other power. So the idea that the United States ought to lead the New World found expression in the Pan-American Congress of Republics convened at Washington in 1891, primarily with a view to the establishment of some general tariff system, though that Congress, as might have been expected, effected nothing, and ended, not without some derision, in a series of pleasure trips by the delegates from the so-called republics of South and Central America. The Monroe Doctrine, however, generally accepted as it is, can hardly be said practically to occupy the mind or influence the current politics of America. Though it would no doubt lead the Government to consider international questions arising even in South America as much more within the scope of their influence than any not directly affecting their own citizens, which might arise in the Old World, still the occasions for its assertion are comparatively few, and are not likely to involve serious difficulties with any European power.

The results of this indifference to foreign politics are in so far unfortunate that they frequently induce carelessness in the choice of persons to represent the United States at European Courts, the Ambassador to Great Britain being usually the only one who has really important negotiations to conduct, and cause very inadequate appropriations to be voted for the support of such envoys. In other respects her detachment has been for the United States an unspeakable blessing. No army is needed, except for the repression of Indian troubles in the far West. The whole military force of the Republic now consists of about 25,000 privates (largely of foreign birth) and 2144 officers. The officers, admirably trained at West Point the famous military academy which has maintained its high character and its absolute freedom from "political affiliations" since its first foundation, are largely occupied in scientific or engineering work. Only a small navy is needed, — a fortunate

circumstance, because the navy yards have sometimes given rise to administrative scandals, scandals, however, which have in no way affected the naval officers but only the civilian politicians who have had a hand in shipbuilding and the provision of armaments and stores. The cry which is sometimes raised for a large increase in the United States fleet seems to a European observer unwise; for the power of the United States to protect her citizens abroad is not to be measured by the number of vessels or guns she possesses, but by the fact that there is no power in the world which will not lose far more than it can possibly gain by quarrelling with a nation which could, in case of war, so vast are its resources, not only create an armoured fleet but speedily equip swift vessels which would destroy the commerce of its antagonist. The possession of powerful armaments is apt to inspire a wish to use them. For many years there has been no cloud on the external horizon, and one may indeed say that the likelihood of a war between the United States and any of the great naval powers is too slight to be worth considering.

The result of this smallness of an army and navy is not only the freedom of the country from militarism of spirit and the slightness of a branch of expenditure which European States find almost insupportable, but the exemption of this Republic from a source of danger which other republics have found so serious, — the ambition of successful generals, and the interference of the army in political strifes. Strong and deep-rooted as are the constitutional traditions of the United States, there have been moments, even in her history, when the existence of a great standing army might have menaced or led to civil war. Patriotism has not suffered, as Europeans sometimes fancy it must suffer, by long-continued peace. Manliness of spirit has not suffered because so few embrace the profession of arms; and the internal politics of the country, already complicated enough, are relieved from those further complications which the intrusion of issues of foreign policy bring with them. It need hardly be added that those issues are the very issues which a democracy, even so intelligent a democracy as that of the United States, is least fitted to comprehend, and which its organs of government are least fitted to handle with promptitude and success. Fortunately, the one

principle to which the people have learnt to cling in foreign policy is, that the less they have of it the better; and though aspiring politicians sometimes try to play upon national pride by using arrogant language to other powers, or by suggesting schemes of annexation, such language is generally reprobated, and such schemes are usually rejected.

To state this tendency of national opinion does not, however, dispose of the question of territorial expansion; for nations are sometimes forced to increase their dominions by causes outside their own desires or volitions. The possibilities that lie before America of such expansion deserve a brief discussion.

Occupying the whole width of their continent from ocean to ocean, the Americans have neighbours only on the north and on the south. It is only in these directions that they could extend themselves by land; and extension on land is much easier and more tempting than by sea. On the north they touch the great Canadian Confederation with its seven provinces, also extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and now bound together by a transcontinental railway. Its population, already about five millions, is rapidly increasing, especially in the North-west, and although legally subject to the British Crown and legislature, it is admittedly mistress of its own destinies. It was at one time deemed a matter of course that the United States would seek to annex Canada, peaceably if possible, but if not, then by force of arms. Even so late as 1864, Englishmen were constantly told that the first result of the triumph of the Federal armies in the War of Secession would be to launch a host flushed with victory against the Canadian Dominion, because when the passion for war has been once roused in a nation, its clamours for fresh conquests. Many were the arguments from history by which it was sought to convince Britain that for her own safety she ought to accede to the wily suggestions which Louis Napoleon addressed to her, deliver the Slave States from defeat and herself from a formidable rival. Since those days Canada has become a far more tempting prize, for part of her north-western territories between Lake Superior and the Rocky Mountains, then believed to be condemned to sterility by their climate, has proved to be one of the richest wheat-growing districts on the continent. The power of the United States is now far greater than in 1865, nor would it be easy for Britain an

nada effectively to defend a frontier so long and so naturally eak as is that which separates the Dominion from its neighurs on the south. Yet to-day the absorption of Canada is tle debated in the United States. If ever it comes about, it ll come about at the wish and by the act of the Canadians emselves, rather than as the result of any external force.

There are several reasons for this. One is the growing endliness of the Americans to Britain. Considering how ich commoner than love is hatred, or at least jealousy, beeen nations, considering the proverbial bitterness of family arrels, and considering how intense was the hatred felt in the nited States towards England fifty years ago,[1] rekindled by e unhappy war of 1812, kept alive by the sensitiveness of the e people and the arrogance of the other, imprinted afresh on w generations in America by silly school-books and Fourth July harangues, inflamed anew by the language of a large ction of English society during the Civil War, it is one of the narkable events of our time that a cordial feeling should now ist between the two chief branches of the English race. The tlement of the Alabama claims has contributed to it. The nocratization of Britain and the growth of literature and ence in America have contributed to it. The greater respect ich Europeans have come to show to America has contribd to it. The occasional appearance of illustrious men who, e Dr. Phillips Brooks and Mr. J. R. Lowell, become dear to h countries, has counted for something. But the ocean amers have done perhaps most of all, because they have bled the two peoples to know one another. Such unfriendly guage towards Britain as still appears in the American press hiefly due to the wish to gratify a section of the Irish popuon, and will probably vanish when the secular hostility of land and England has passed away. The old motives for attack upon Canada have therefore vanished. But there is son to think that even if Canada were separated from the tish Empire, the Americans would not be eager to bring her o the Union. They would not try to do so by force, because

[1] Tocqueville, for instance, says (vol. ii. ch. 10): "On ne saurait voir de e plus envenimée que celle qui existe entre les Américains des États Unis s Anglais." And old men will tell you in America that their recollections to the same effect.

that would be contrary to their doctrines and habits. The have a well-grounded aversion, strengthened by their exper ence of the difficulties of ruling the South after 1865, to th incorporation or control of any community not anxious to b one with them and thoroughly in harmony with their own bod Although they would rejoice over so great an extension territory and resources, they are well satisfied with the prese size and progress of their own country. Moreover, each of th two great parties has misgivings as to the effect which the add tion of Canada might have on the political character of th electorate. The Democrats have feared that the people Ontario and Manitoba would secure preponderance to th Republicans. The Republicans have been equally suspicio of the Roman Catholic French of Lower Canada. Both parti feel that a disturbing and unpredictable element would introduced into their calculations. Hence, though neither ca feel certain that it would lose, neither is sufficiently clear th it would gain to induce it to raise the question in a practic form.

The geographical position of Canada towards the Unit States, and particularly the increasingly close relations whi must subsist between her Western provinces, Manitoba a British Columbia, and their Southern neighbours, may see to suggest that sooner or later political union will come abou It need hardly be said that there is little difference betwe the populations, save that there is a stronger Scotch eleme in Western Canada than in Minnesota, Dakota, Montana, a Washington, where, especially in the two former, one fin far more Germans and Scandinavians than in Manitoba. T material growth of Canada would probably be quickened union, and the plan of a commercial league or customs uni which has lately been discussed might, if carried out, lead a political union: indeed, it is hard to see how otherw Canada could have her fair share in adjusting such tar changes as might from time to time become necessary. B the present tariff arrangements are unstable in both countrie and, so far as a stranger can gather, the temper and feelin of the Canadians, and the growth of a vigorous national sen ment among them, do not at present make for their absorpti into the far larger mass of the United States, which they ha

herto regarded with jealousy. Their life, and that not as spects politics only, is doubtless less intense than the life of eir neighbours to the South. But it is free from some of e blemishes which affect the latter. Municipal governments e more pure. Party organizations have not fallen under the ntrol of bosses. Public order has been less disturbed; and minal justice is more effectively administered.

This is not the place for considering what are the interests the matter of Great Britain and her other colonies, nor the spects of the schemes suggested for a closer practical union tween the mother country and her swiftly advancing progeny. regards the ultimate interests of the two peoples most rectly concerned, it may be suggested that it is more to the vantage, both of the United States and of the Canadians, at they should for the present continue to develop inde-ndent types of political life and intellectual progress. Each y, in working out its own institutions, have something to ch the other. There is already too little variety on the nerican continent.

Fifteen hundred miles south of British Columbia the United tes abuts upon Mexico. The position of Mexico offers a iking contrast to that of Canada. The people are utterly like those of the United States; they are bigoted Roman tholics, more than half Indian in blood and preserving many dian superstitions, listless, uncultured, making little advance self-government, whether local or national, increasing but wly in numbers,[1] unprogressive in all directions. They do le to develop either the mineral or agricultural wealth of ir superb territory, much of which, in fact all the interior teau, enjoys a climate more favourable to physical exertion n that of the southernmost States of the Union. The export l import trade of the ports on the Gulf and the Pacific is the hands of German and English houses: the mines of the th are worked by Americans, who come across from Texas Arizona in greater and greater numbers. Three railways v pierce Northern Mexico from the Union, one reaching the ific at Guaymas on the Gulf of California, two others

[1] The population of Mexico is 11,600,000, of whom 20 per cent are stated e pure whites, 43 per cent of mixed race, and the remaining 37 per cent ans.

crossing the great plateau from the Rio Grande as far as the city of Mexico. The mining regions of Chihuahua and Sonora (the northernmost States of the Mexican federation) are already half American, for the capital is theirs, communications are worked by them, their language spreads, their influence becomes paramount. As the mines of Colorado and Arizona become less and less attractive, the stream of immigration will more and more set out of the United States across the border. If American citizens are killed, or their property attacked, the United States Government will be invoked, and will find difficulties in dealing with a weak government like the Mexican, which cannot always keep order in its own dominions. It is far from improbable that the American settlers, as their numbers grow, will be tempted to establish order for themselves, and perhaps at last some sort of government. In fact, the process by which Texas was severed from Mexico and brought into the Union may conceivably be repeated in a more peaceful way by the steady infiltration of an American population. It is all but impossible for a feeble state, full of natural wealth which her people do not use, not to crumble under the impact of a stronger and more enterprising race. All experience points to the detachment of province after province from Mexico and its absorption into the American Union; nor when the process has once begun need it stop till in a time to be measured rather by decades than by centuries the petty republics of Central America have been also swallowed up and the predominant influence, if not the territorial frontier, of the United States has advanced to the isthmus of Panama.

If the United States were a monarchy like Russia, this would certainly happen, happen not so much from any deliberate purpose of aggression as by the irresistible tendency of facts, a tendency similar to that which led Rome to conquer the East, England to conquer India, Russia to conquer North-western Asia. But the Americans are most unwilling that it should happen, and will do all they can to prevent it. They have none of that earth hunger which burns in the great nations of Europe having already dominions which it may take a century to people fully. They are proud of the capacity of their present population for self-government. Their administrative system

ngularly unfitted for the rule of dependencies, because it has o proper machinery for controlling provincial governors; so hat when it finds regions which are hardly fit to be established s States, it nevertheless gives them a practically all but com- lete self-government as Territories. Administrative posts set p in a dependent country would certainly be jobbed, and the ependent country itself probably maladministered. Nearly l the work which the Federal authorities have had to do of his kind has been badly done, and has given rise to scandals. Hence the only form annexation can with advantage take is the dmission of the annexed district as a self-governing State or erritory, the difference between the two being that in the tter the inhabitants, though they are usually permitted to dminister their domestic affairs, have no vote in Federal elec- ons. If Chihuahua and Sonora were like Dakota, the temp- tion to annex these provinces and turn them into States or erritories would be strong. But the Indo-Spaniards of Mexico ave, in the seventy years that have passed since they revolted om Spain, shown little fitness for the exercise of political ower. They are hardly more advanced in this direction than he Moors or the Samoans. They would be not only an inferior nd diverse element in the Union, but a mischievous element, ertain, if they were admitted to Federal suffrage, to injure ederal politics, to demoralize the officials who might be sent mong them, and to supply a fertile soil for all kinds of roguery nd rascality, which, so far as they lay within the sphere of tate action, the Federal Government could not interfere with, nd which in Federal affairs would damage Congress and bring nother swarm of jobs and jobbers to Washington. Eight illions of recently enfranchised negroes (not to speak of cent immigrants from Europe) are a heavy enough load for e Anglo-Americans to carry on their shoulders without the norance and semi-barbarism of the mixed races of the tropics. One finds in the United States, and of course especially in rizona, New Mexico, and Texas, many people who declare that exico will be swallowed, first the northern provinces, and e whole in time. It is "manifest destiny," and the land and ining-claim speculators of these border lands would be glad to lp Destiny. But the general feeling of the nation is strongly ainst a forward policy, nor has either party any such interest

in promoting it as the Southern slave-holders had fifty-five years ago in bringing in Texas. It is therefore not a question of practical politics. Yet it is a problem which already deserves consideration, for the future in which it may become practical is not distant. It is a disquieting problem. The clearest judgment and the firmest will of a nation cannot always resist the drift of events and the working of natural causes.

I have already observed that the United States Government formerly desired and seemed likely to acquire some of the West India islands. The South had a strong motive for adding to the Union regions in which slavery prevailed, and which would have been admitted as Slave States. That motive has long since vanished: and so far as the South has now an interest in these isles it is that they should remain outside the line of American custom-houses, so that their products may not compete free of duty with those which the South raises. All the objections which apply to the incorporation of Northern Mexico apply with greater force to the incorporation of islands far less fit for colonization by the Anglo-American race than are the Mexican table-lands. One islet only, Navassa, between Jamaica and San Domingo, belongs to the United States.

There is, however, one spot beyond the limits of the North American continent in which Americans have, ever since 1843 (when there was for a time a risk of its being occupied by England), declared that they feel directly interested. This is the island group of Hawaii, which lies 2000 miles to the southwest of San Francisco. Great as this distance is, the Americans conceive that the position of these isles over against their own Western coast would be so threatening to their commerce in a war between the United States and any naval power, that they cannot suffer the islands to be occupied by, or even to fall under the influence of, any European nation. No European nation has of late years betrayed any design of acquiring such an influence, while Great Britain and France have expressly renounced it. However, the United States Government, wishful to provide against emergencies, has endeavoured to purchase land at Pearl River in Oahu, reputed the best harbour in the group, with the view of establishing a naval station there.

To forecast the future of the Hawaiian Isles is by no means asy.

The population is at present (census of 1890) 89,990, of hom 34,000 are native Hawaiians (besides 6000 half-castes), 5,000 Chinese, 12,000 Japanese, 8600 Portuguese (recently nported to work the sugar plantations), and about 12,000 ersons of European or American origin. Among these the mericans stand first in number; Englishmen come next and ermans third. The control of affairs has been practically in he hands of the whites, American and British, though Portuuese as well as native Hawaiians enjoy the suffrage. Things ent on well since, from the time when, in the days of the late ing, an unscrupulous Prime Minister was expelled by a sort of loodless revolution, until the rising of 1892, when (apparently ith the connivance of the person then representing the United tates) Queen Liliuokalani was with equal ease dethroned. he provisional government then offered the islands to the nited States, and even concluded a treaty providing for their nnexation, which President Harrison submitted to the Senate.[1] efore the Senate acted upon it, a new President came into fice and withdrew the treaty, intimating his disapproval of ny "acquisition of new and distant territory," a disapproval which public opinion seems to have joined. At present, hough nothing has been constitutionally settled as to the ture form of government, peace and order are not seriously sturbed. The ruling white population, which is of a good pe, and has hitherto kept free from scandals such as gather und the politics of San Francisco, may well, either under a storied monarchy or a republic, continue to administer the lands with success. But as the native race, which Captain ook estimated at 300,000, has sunk since 1866 from 57,000 to ,000 and is likely to go on declining, it would have been difcult, even had no revolution intervened, to maintain a native nasty, or indeed a monarchy of any kind: and the tendency seek annexation to the United States must in any case have en strong. There may not, however, be in the future, any ore than now, a preponderating wish in the United States to

[1] It has been doubted whether the President and Senate are entitled under e treaty making power given by the Constitution to acquire for the United ates territories lying far away from the North American continent.

acquire the islands and admit them to the Union as a State o Territory. Their white population is at present far too smal to make either course desirable — the registered voters wer (in 1893) about 1800 persons of European or American stock with 9554 natives and half-castes; — the presence of a larg Asiatic population would, in view of recent Federal legislatio against the Chinese, raise serious difficulties; and in case o war with a naval power the obligation of defending ther might be found burdensome, although they are not quite s distant from the American coast as some of the Aleutia isles, acquired when Alaska was purchased. It is, howeve certain that the Americans would not stand by and see an other nation establish a protectorate over them.

The fate of Western South America belongs to a still mor distant future; but it can hardly remain unconnected wit what is already by far the greatest power in the Weste hemisphere. When capital, which is accumulating in th United States with extraordinary rapidity, is no longer abl to find highly profitable employment in the development o Western North America, it will tend to seek other field When population has filled up the present territory of th United States, enterprising spirits will overflow into und veloped regions. The nearest of these is Western Sout America, the elevated plateaux of which are habitable b Northern races. It may be conjectured that the relations o the vast territories in Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia,[1] for whic the Spaniards have done so little, and which can hardly remai for ever neglected, will one day become far closer with th United States than with any European power.

[1] These three countries have a total area of about 1,500,000 square mile with a settled population not exceeding 5,500,000, besides an unascertain number of uncivilized Indians.

CHAPTER XCV

LAISSEZ FAIRE

A European friend of a philosophic turn of mind bade me, ien he heard that I was writing this book, dedicate at least e chapter to the American Theory of the State. I answered at the Americans had no theory of the State, and felt no need one, being content, like the English, to base their constitu- nal ideas upon law and history.

In England and America alike (I pursued) one misses a whole cle and system of ideas and sentiments which have been potent ong the nations of the European continent. To those nations e State is a great moral power, the totality of the wisdom and science and force of the people, yet greater far than the sum the individuals who compose the people, because consciously l scientifically, if also by a law of nature, organized for rposes which the people indistinctly apprehend, and because s the inheritor of a deep-rooted reverence and an almost potic authority. There is a touch of mysticism in this con- tion, which has survived the change from arbitrary to repre- tative government, and almost recalls the sacredness that d to surround the mediæval church. In England the tradi- ns of an ancient monarchy and the social influence of the ss which till lately governed have enabled the State and its vice to retain a measure of influence and respect. No one, vever, attributes any special wisdom to the State, no one ats those concerned with administration or legislation as a erior class. Officials are strictly held within the limits of ir legal powers, and are obeyed only so far as they can show t they are carrying out the positive directions of the law. eir conduct, and indeed the decisions of the highest State ans, are criticised, perhaps with more courtesy, but otherwise exactly the same way as those of other persons and bodies.

Yet the State is dignified, and men are proud to serve it. Fr
the American mind, that which may be called the mystic asp
of the State, and the theory of its vast range of action, are
conspicuously absent as they are from the English. They
absent, not because America is a democracy, but because t
political ideas of the two branches of the race are fundam
tally the same, a fact which continental observers of the Uni
States constantly fail to appreciate. In America, howev
even the dignity of the State has vanished. It seems actua
less than the individuals who live under it. The people, t
is to say the vast multitude of men who inhabit the count
inspire admiration, the organism is ignored. The State is no
ing but a name for the legislative and administrative machin
whereby certain business of the inhabitants is despatched.
has no more conscience, or moral mission, or title to awe
respect, than a commercial company for working a railroad
a mine; and those who represent it are treated in public
in private with quite as little deference.

Hereupon my friend rejoined that people in America m
at least have some general views about the functions of gov
ment and its relations to the individual. "We are told,"
continued, "that the whole American polity is more cohere
more self-consistent than that of England; it must theref
have what the Germans call 'ground-ideas.' There is a pr
sion of legislation. Legislation must proceed upon these id
and by examining the current legislation of the Federal gov
ment and of the States you will be able to discover and pres
the beliefs and notions regarding the State which the Americ
cherish."

The term "ground-ideas" does not happily describe the
trines that prevail in the United States, for the people are
prone to form or state their notions in a philosophic w
There are, however, certain dogmas or maxims which are i
far fundamental that they have told widely on political thou
and that one usually strikes upon them when sinking a sh
so to speak, into an American mind. Among such dogmas
the following:—

Certain rights of the individual, as, for instance, his righ
the enjoyment of what he has earned, and to the free exp
sion of his opinions, are primordial and sacred.

All political power springs from the people, and the most mpletely popular government is the best.

Legislatures, officials, and all other agents of the sovereign ople ought to be strictly limited by law, by each other, and the shortness of the terms of office.

Where any function can be equally well discharged by a tral or by a local body, it ought by preference to be entrusted the local body, for a centralized administration is more likely be tyrannical, inefficient, and impure than one which, being a small scale, is more fully within the knowledge of the izens and more sensitive to their opinion.

Two men are wiser than one, one hundred than ninety-nine, rty millions than twenty-nine millions. Whether they are ser or not, the will of the larger number must prevail against will of the smaller. But the majority is not wiser because s called the Nation, or because it controls the government, only because it is more numerous. The nation is nothing so many individuals. The government is nothing but tain representatives and officials, agents who are here to-day l gone to-morrow.

The less of government the better; that is to say, the fewer asions for interfering with individual citizens are allowed officials, and the less time citizens have to spend in looking er their officials, so much the more will the citizens and the mmunity prosper. The functions of government must be ot at their minimum.

The first five of these dogmas have been discussed and illus-ted in earlier chapters. The last of them needs a little mination, because it suggests points of comparison with the World, and because the meaning of it lies in the applica-n. It is all very well to say that the functions of govern-nt should be kept at a minimum; but the bureaucrats of ssia might say the same. What is this minimum? Every ion, every government, every philosopher, has his own view so the functions which it must be taken to include.

The doctrine of *Laissez faire*, or non-interference by govern-nt with the citizen, has two foundations, which may be called sentimental and the rational. The sentimental ground is desire of the individual to be let alone, to do as he pleases, ulge his impulses, follow out his projects. The rational

ground is the principle, gathered from an observation of t
phenomena of society, that interference by government mo
often does harm than good — that is to say, that the desir
and impulses of men when left to themselves are more like
by their natural collision and co-operation to work out a hap
result for the community and the individuals that compose
than will be attained by the conscious endeavours of the sta
controlling and directing those desires and impulses. The
are laws of nature governing mankind as well as the materi
world; and man will thrive better under these laws than und
those which he makes for himself through the organization
call Government.

Of these two views, the former or sentimental has been e
tremely strong in America, being rooted in the character a
habits of the race, and seeming to issue from that assertion
individual liberty which is proclaimed in such revered doc
ments as the Declaration of Independence and the older Sta
constitutions. The latter view, incessantly canvassed in Euro
has played no great part in the United States; or rather it h
appeared in the form not of a philosophic induction from e
perience, but of a common-sense notion that everybody kno
his own business best, that individual enterprise has "ma
America," and will "run America," better than the best gove
ment could do.

The State governments of 1776 and the National governme
of 1789 started from ideas, mental habits, and administrati
practice generally similar to those of contemporary Englan
Now England in the eighteenth century was that one amo
European countries in which government had the narrow
sphere. The primitive paternal legislation of the later midd
ages had been abandoned. The central government had n
begun to stretch out its arms to interfere with quarter sessio
in the counties, or municipal corporations in the towns,
care for the health, or education, or morals of the people. Th
strengthening and reorganization of administration which w
in progress in many parts of the continent, as in Prussia und
Frederick the Great, and in Portugal under Pombal, had n
spread to England, and would have been resisted there by m
of conservative tendencies for one set of reasons, and men
liberal tendencies for another. Everything tended to ma

United States in this respect more English than England, the circumstances of colonial life, the process of settling western wilderness, the feelings evoked by the struggle nst George III., all went to intensify individualism, the of enterprise, and the pride in personal freedom. And n that day to this, individualism, the love of enterprise, the pride in personal freedom, have been deemed by Ameri- not only their choicest, but their peculiar and exclusive essions.

he hundred years which have passed since the birth of the ublic have, however, brought many changes with them. ividualism is no longer threatened by arbitrary kings, and ramparts erected to protect it from their attacks are useless grass-grown. If any assaults are to be feared they will e from another quarter. New causes are at work in the ld tending not only to lengthen the arms of government, to make its touch quicker and firmer. Do these causes rate in America as well as in Europe? and, if so, does erica, in virtue of her stronger historical attachment to vidualism, oppose a more effective resistance to them?

will mention a few among them. Modern civilization, in ming more complex and refined, has become more exacting. iscerns more benefits which the organized power of govern- t can secure, and grows more anxious to attain them. live fast, and are impatient of the slow working of ral laws. The triumphs of physical science have enlarged r desires for comfort, and shown them how many things be accomplished by the application of collective skill and e funds which are beyond the reach of individual effort. greater has been the influence of a quickened moral sensi- ness and philanthropic sympathy. The sight of preventable is painful, and is felt as a reproach. He who preaches ence and reliance upon natural progress is thought callous. sense of sin may, as theologians tell us, be declining; but dislike to degrading and brutalizing vice is increasing; there warmer recognition of the responsibility of each man for neighbour, and a more earnest zeal in works of moral reform. e doctrines which, because they had satisfied philosophers, in the last generation accepted by the bulk of educated have now become, if not discredited by experience, yet

far from popular. They are thought to be less universally t
less completely beneficial, than was at first supposed. Th
are benefits which the laws of demand and supply do not
cure. Unlimited competition seems to press too hardly on
weak. The power of groups of men organized by incorpora
as joint-stock companies, or of small knots of rich men ac
in combination, has developed with unexpected strength
unexpected ways, overshadowing individuals and even com
nities, and showing that the very freedom of association wh
men sought to secure by law when they were threatened by
violence of potentates may, under the shelter of the law, ri
into a new form of tyranny. And in some countries, of wh
Britain may be taken as the type, the transference of polit
power from the few to the many has made the many less jea
of governmental authority. The government is now t
creature, their instrument — why should they fear to use
They may strip it to-morrow of the power with which they l
clothed it to-day. They may rest confident that its power
not be used contrary to the wishes of the majority among th
selves. And as it is in this majority that authority has
been vested, they readily assume that the majority will be ri

How potent these influences and arguments have prove
the old countries of Europe, how much support they receive
only from popular sentiment, but from the writings of a vi
ous school of philosophical economists, all the world kn
But what of newer communities, where the evils to be comb
by state action are fewer, where the spirit of liberty and
sentiment of individualism are more intense? An emi
English statesman expresses the general belief of English
when he says: —

"How is it that while the increasing democracy at home is insis
with such growing eagerness, on more control by the state, we see so
a corresponding development of the same principle in the United Stat
in Anglo-Saxon colonies? It is clearly not simply the democratic
which demands so much central regulation. Otherwise we should
the same conditions in the Anglo-Saxon democracies across the seas

This belief of Englishmen is also the general belief of A
cans. I suppose that nine men out of ten would tell a stra
that both the Federal government and the State governm

[1] Mr. Goschen, in an address delivered at Edinburgh in 1883.

fered little, and would ascribe the prosperity of the country
is non-interference as well as to the self-reliant spirit of
people. So far as there can be said to be any theory on the
ect in a land which gets on without theories, *laissez aller*
been the orthodox and accepted doctrine in the sphere
of Federal and of State legislation.

evertheless the belief is groundless. The new democracies
merica are just as eager for state interference as the democ-
of Britain, and try their experiments with even more light-
ted promptitude. No one need be surprised at this when
eflects that the causes which have been mentioned as telling
Europe, tell on the United States with no less force. Men
even more eager than in Europe to hasten on to the ends
desire, even more impatient of the delays which a reliance
atural forces involves, even more sensitive to the wretched-
of their fellows, and to the mischiefs which vice and igno-
e breed. Unrestricted competition has shown its dark side:
t corporations have been more powerful than in Britain,
more inclined to abuse their power. Having lived longer
r a democratic government, the American masses have
zed more perfectly than those of Europe that they are
nselves the government. Their absolute command of its
nization (except where constitutional checks are inter-
d) makes them turn more quickly to it for the accomplish-
t of their purposes. And in the State legislatures they
ess bodies with which it is easy to try legislative experi-
ts, since these bodies, though not of themselves disposed
novation, are mainly composed of men unskilled in eco-
ics, inapt to foresee any but the nearest consequences of
measures, prone to gratify any whim of their constituents,
open to the pressure of any section whose self-interest or
tient philanthropy clamours for some departure from the
ral principles of legislation. For crotchet-mongers as well
r intriguers there is no such paradise as the lobby of a
e legislature. No responsible statesman is there to oppose
, no warning voice will be raised by a scientific economist.
us it has come to pass that, though the Americans have
eory of the State and take a narrow view of its functions,
gh they conceive themselves to be devoted to *laissez faire*
inciple, and to be in practice the most self-reliant of peo-

ples, they have grown no less accustomed than the English carry the action of government into ever-widening fields. E nomic theory did not stop them, for practical men are pro of getting on without theory.[1] The sentiment of individualis did not stop them, because State intervention has usually tak the form of helping or protecting the greater number, wh restraining the few; and personal freedom of action, the lo of which is strong enough to repel the paternalism of Fran or Germany, has been infringed upon only at the bidding of strong moral sentiment, such as that which condemns inte perance. So gradual has been the process of transition this new habit that few but lawyers and economists have become aware of it, and the lamentations with which o fashioned English thinkers accompany the march of legislati are in America scarcely heard and wholly unheeded.

As the field of ordinary private law and administrati belongs to the States, it is chiefly in State legislation that must look for instances of governmental intervention. Rece illustrations of the tendency to do by law what men we formerly left to do for themselves, and to prohibit by law a of omission and commission which used to pass unregarde might be culled in abundance from the statute-books of nea every commonwealth.[2] It is in the West, which plumes its on being pre-eminently the land of freedom, enterprise, a self-help, that this tendency is most active and plays strangest pranks, because legislators are, in the West, m impatient and self-confident than elsewhere.

The forms which legislative intervention takes may roughly classified under the following heads: —

Prohibitions to individuals to do acts which are not, in ordinary sense of the word, criminal (*e.g.* to sell intoxicat liquors, to employ a labourer for more than so many hours a day).

Directions to individuals to do things which it is not viously wrong to omit (*e.g.* to provide seats for shop-wom to publish the accounts of a railway company).

[1] Till recently, there has been little theoretical discussion of these quest in the United States. At present the two tendencies, that of *Laissez faire* that which leans to State interference, are well represented by able writer

[2] I have collected some instances in a note to this chapter. See also article by Dr. Albert Shaw in *Contemporary Review* for May, 1887.

Interferences with the ordinary course of law in order to otect individuals from the consequences of their own acts .g. the annulment of contracts between employer and work-en making the former not liable for accidental injuries to e latter, the exemption of homesteads, or of a certain amount personal property, from the claims of creditors, the prohi-ion of more than a certain rate of interest on money).

Directions to a public authority to undertake work which ght be left to individual action and the operation of supply d demand (*e.g.* the providing of schools and dispensaries, e establishment of State analysts, State oil inspectors, the llection and diffusion, at the public expense, of statistics).

Retention, appropriation, or control by the State of certain tural sources of wealth or elements in its production (*e.g.* e declaration, made by Washington, Wyoming, Montana, and aho, that the use of all waters, whether still or flowing, within eir respective bounds, is a public use, and for ever subject to ate control, the prohibition by Indiana of the wasteful use natural gas).

In every one of these kinds of legislative interference the nericans, or at least the Western States, seem to have gone rther than the English Parliament. The restrictions on the uor traffic have been more sweeping; those upon the labour women and children, and of persons employed by the State, t less so. Moral duties are more frequently enforced by al penalties than in England. Railroads, insurance and nking companies, and other corporations are, in most States, ictly regulated. Efforts to protect individuals coming under third head are so frequent and indulgent that their policy beginning to be seriously questioned.[1] Gratuitous elemen-

[1] "A numerous and ever-increasing list of possessions has been entirely mpted from execution for debt, starting with the traditional homestead, going on through all the necessities of life, implements of trade, and even ner-lots and money, until, in some States, as in Texas, almost every con-able object of desire, from a house and corner-lot to a span of fast horses, y be held and enjoyed by the poor man free from all claims of his creditors. hout going further into details it may be boldly stated that the tendency lemocratic legislation on this subject has been to require the repayment of ts only when it can be made out of superfluous accumulated capital."—F. J. Stimson, in a vigorous and thoughtful article on the "Ethics of nocracy," in *Scribner's Magazine* for June, 1887.

The latest Constitution of Texas provides that where a contractor becomes krupt, the labourers employed by him shall have a right of action against

tary and secondary education is provided all over the Unio and in the West there are also gratuitous State universitie open to women as well as to men. And although the Sta has not gone so far in superseding individual action as create for itself monopolies, it is apt to spend money on som objects not equally cared for by European governments. tries to prevent adulteration by putting its stamp on agricu tural fertilizers, and prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine; establishes dairy commissions, bureaux of animal industr and boards of live-stock commissioners armed with wid powers of inspection, it distributes seed to farmers, provides State chemist to analyze soils gratuitously and recommend th appropriate fertilizers, subsidizes agricultural fairs, sends rou lecturers on agriculture, and encourages by bounties the cu ture of beetroot and manufacture of sugar therefrom, th making of starch from State-grown potatoes, tree-plantin and the killing of noxious animals, — English sparrows Massachusetts, panthers and wolves in Wyoming.[1] The farm of Kansas or Iowa is more palpably the object of the patern solicitude of his legislature than the farmer of any Europea country. And in the pursuit of its schemes for blessing th community the State raises a taxation which would be co plained of in a less prosperous country.[2]

What has been the result of this legislation? Have th effects which the economists of the physiocratic or *laissez all* school taught us to expect actually followed? Has the natur course of commerce and industry been disturbed, has the se helpfulness of the citizen been weakened, has government do its work ill and a new door to jobbery been opened? It still too soon to form conclusions on these points. Some fe

the company or person for whose benefit the work on which they w employed was done.

[1] In Kansas the gift of bounties for the heads of coyotes (prairie-wolv led to the rearing of these animals on a large scale in a new description stock-farms!

[2] "Speaking broadly, and including indirect taxation, it may be sta that the laws now purport to give the State power to dispose of at least o third the annual revenues of property. . . . Of course these taxes are large by the richest citizens, evaded, but upon land at least they are effectual. is certainly understating it to say that the general taxation upon land equ one-third the net rents, *i.e.* Ricardo's margin of cultivation less expenses management." — Stimson, *ut supra*.

f the experiments have failed, others seem to be succeeding; ut the policy of State interference as a whole has not yet een adequately tested. In making this new departure Amer- an legislatures are serving the world, if not their own citi- ens, for they are providing it with a store of valuable data or its instruction, data which deserve more attention than ney have hitherto received, and whose value will increase as me goes on.

It is the privilege of these unconscious philosophers to try xperiments with less risk than countries like France or Eng- nd would have to run, for the bodies on which the experi- ents are tried are so relatively small and exceptionally vig- rous that failures need not inflict permanent injury. No eople is shrewder than the American in perceiving when a w works ill, nor prompter in repealing it.

NOTE.

I COLLECT a few instances of recent legislation illustrating the tendency extend State intervention and the scope of penal law: —

New York provides that no guest shall be excluded from any hotel on count of race, creed (some had refused to receive Jews), or colour.

Wisconsin requires every hotel above a certain height to be furnished th fireproof staircases; and Michigan punishes the proprietors of any op or factory in which the health of employés is endangered by im- oper heating, lighting, ventilation or sanitarian arrangements.

Michigan compels railroad companies to provide automatic car coup- gs, so that employés shall not need to go between the cars. Other ates direct the use of certain kinds of brakes.

Georgia orders railway companies to put up a bulletin stating how ich any train already half an hour late is overdue; Arkansas requires is even if the train is only a few minutes late.

Wyoming requires railroads passing within four miles of any city to ovide, at the nearest point, a depot whereat all local trains shall stop; hile Arkansas forbids baggage to be tumbled from cars on to the plat- rm at a depot; and Ohio permits no one to be engaged as a train con- ctor unless he has had two years' previous experience as train hand.

Massachusetts forbids the employment of colour-blind persons on rail- ys, and provides for the examination of those so employed.

Ohio requires druggists to place on bottles containing poison a red bel, naming at least two of the most readily procurable antidotes.

Several States order employers to find seats for women employed in ops, warehouses, or manufactories.

Several States forbid any one to practise medicine or dentistry unle licensed by a State Board.

Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Illinois compel corporations to p workmen weekly. (Massachusetts lately forbade employers to dedu fines from the sums payable by them for wages, but the Supreme Cou of the State [by a majority] held the statute unconstitutional.)

Maryland institutes a "State Board of Commissioners of Practic Plumbing," and confines the practice of that industry to persons licens by the same. New York provides Boards of Examiners to superv plumber's work.

Kansas punishes the making any misrepresentation to or deceivi any person in the sale of fruit or shade trees, shrubs or bulbs; and N Jersey does the like as regards fruit trees or briars.

Mississippi punishes with fine and imprisonment any legislative, exec tive, judicial, or ministerial officer, who shall travel on any railroad wi out paying absolutely, and without any evasion whatever, the same fa as is required of passengers generally.

Many States offer bounties on the raising of various agricultural pro ucts or on manufactures, while California appropriates money for t introduction from Australia of parasites and predaceous insects, with view to the extermination of a moth which injures orange trees.

Texas makes it a punishable misdemeanour to deal in "futures" "keep any 'bucket shop' or other establishment where future contra are bought or sold with no intention of an actual delivery of the arti so bought or sold," while Massachusetts is content with making su contracts voidable.

Michigan prescribes a system of minority voting at the election directors of joint-stock corporations; Kentucky (by her new constitutio prescribes cumulative voting in like cases.

Pennsylvania forbids the consolidation of telegraph companies.

Ohio punishes by fine and imprisonment the offering to sell "option or exhibiting any quotations of the prices of "margins," "futures," "options." Georgia imposes on dealers in "futures" a tax of $50 year.

New York forbids the hiring of barmaids, and Colorado permits woman to enter a "wine room."

Colorado, Kansas, and North Carolina, make the seduction un promise of marriage of any chaste woman a felony.

New York punishes with fine and imprisonment any person "w shall send a letter with intent to cause annoyance to any other person.

Virginia punishes with death the destruction by dynamite or any ot explosive of any dwelling, if at night, or endangering human life.

Kentucky makes it a misdemeanour to play with dice any game money, and a felony to keep, manage, or operate any such game.

Washington punishes any one who permits a minor to play at ca in his house without the written permission of the minor's parent guardian.

Maine requires every public school teacher to devote not less than
n minutes per week to instruction in the principles of kindness to birds
d animals, and punishes any nurse who fails at once to report to a
ysician that the eye of an infant has become reddened or inflamed
thin five weeks after birth. Rhode Island in a similar statute fixes a
rtnight from birth and allows six hours for the report.

Illinois and Arizona forbid marriages between first cousins.

Virginia punishes with a fine of $100 the sale to a minor, not only of
stols, dirks, and bowie-knives, but also of cigarettes. Twenty-four
her States have similar laws forbidding minors to smoke or chew
bacco in public. Arizona makes it penal to sell or give liquor to a
nor without his parent's consent, or even to admit him to a saloon.

Kentucky prohibits the sale of any book or periodical, "the chief
ature of which is to record the commission of crimes, or display by cuts
illustrations of crimes committed, or the pictures of criminals, des-
radoes, or fugitives from justice, or of men or women influenced by
mulants"; and North Dakota punishes the sale or gift to, and even the
hibition within sight of, any minor of any book, magazine, or newspaper
principally made up of criminal news or pictures, stories of deeds of
oodshed, lust, or crime."

Some States permit judges to hear in private cases the evidence in
ich is of an obscene nature.

Massachusetts compels insurance companies to insure the lives of col-
red persons on the same terms with those of whites.

Minnesota enacts that all labour performed by contract upon a build-
g shall be a first lien thereon; and declares that the fact that the person
rforming the labour was not enjoined from so doing shall be conclusive
idence of the contract; while Iowa gives to all workers in coal mines a
n for their wages upon all property used in constructing and working
e mine.

Alabama makes it a punishable offence for a banker to discount at a
gher rate than 8 per cent.

Many States have stringent usury laws.

Pennsylvania forbids a mortgagee to contract for the payment by the
rtgagor of any taxes over and above the interest payable.

Kentucky and some other States have been making strenuous (but
perfectly successful) efforts to extinguish lotteries. Nevada appears to
ve authorized one.

Five new States by their constitutions, and many others by statutes,
deavour to destroy the recently developed trade combinations of capi-
ists called "Trusts," treating them as conspiracies, and threatening
ere penalties against those concerned in them.

Laws purporting to limit the hours of adult male labour have been
ssed by Congress and in many States. None, however, appear to for-
l under penalty overtime work, except as respects public servants
nder the Federal Government, and in Massachusetts, Maryland, Penn-
vania, Colorado) the limit being 8 or 9 hours, railway servants (Mary-

PENNSYLVANIA STATE LIBRARY

land, New Jersey, Michigan) (10 to 12 hours), and coal-miners (Wyomin
(8 hours). These laws, in fact, amount to little more than a declarati
that the number of hours mentioned shall (except as aforesaid) constitu
a legal day's work in the absence of an agreement for longer service.

Congress and the legislatures of at least fourteen States have
statute created or provided for the creation of Boards of Arbitration
trade disputes, but have conferred very restricted powers for that purpos

CHAPTER XCVI

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Although the question of admitting women to active politi-
l rights cannot be called one of the foremost issues of to-day
the United States, its history and present position are so
lustrative of the way in which political proposals spring up,
d are agitated and handled in that country, that it would
serve to be here noticed, even were it not a matter which has
present interest for at least one European country. All those
ho have speculated on the foundations of human society and
overnment have long been confronted by the question how far
fferences of sex ought to imply and prescribe a distinction of
vic rights and functions between men and women. Some
the bolder among philosophers have answered the question
simply ignoring the differences. Perceiving in women an
telligence and will, which, if never equal to that of the very
rongest men, yet makes the average woman the equal for
ost purposes of the average man, inasmuch as she gains in
ickness and delicacy of perception what she loses in force
d endurance, they have found no reason why woman should
t share the labours, duties, and privileges of man. This was
ato's view, pushed by him so far as to expunge marriage and
mestic life altogether; and it has found expression in more
an one religious movement in ancient as well as in modern
nes.

Christianity approached the problem from another side.
cognizing in woman an immortal soul equally precious with
e soul of man, the New Testament and the usages of the
mitive church opened to her a wide range of functions, vir-
es, and glories, in some of which she was fitted to surpass,
d has in fact surpassed man; while the imagination of the
ddle Ages, more intense and fervid than that of any other

epoch in history, created an ideal of feminine sweetness, purit and moral beauty infinitely surpassing that of the ancie world, and which the modern world may count as its noble possession, an ideal on the preservation of which, more perha than of any other human conception, the welfare of the ra depends.

The consecration of the spiritual equality of woman wou doubtless have gone still farther than it did to secure for her tangible equality in social and possibly even in political ma ters but for the rudeness of the times, in which physical for counted for much, and for the growth of a sacramental a sacerdotal system, which confined priesthood and the admin tration of certain life-giving sacraments to men. Thus, thou the relations of the sexes were placed on a more wholeso basis than in Greek and Roman antiquity, though the standa of purity was raised and the conception of marriage dignifie the recognition of equality in the sphere of law, both priva and public, was less complete than might have been expecte When sacramentalism and sacerdotalism were, in the peopl of Northern Europe, shattered by the religious movement the sixteenth century, the idea of a clerical order confined men was nevertheless maintained, except in a few small sect and though the law grew constantly more just and humane women, scarcely a voice was raised to claim for them a sha in the privileges of public life.

In the early days of the American Republic it seems to ha occurred to no statesman, though it did occur to a few kee witted women, that the principles of the Declaration of In pendence might find application without distinction of se but as they were not to be applied to men of any other colo but white, this need the less be wondered at. However, t legal position of women was speedily improved. State leg lation gave them fuller rights of property and a better soc status than they had enjoyed under the English common la and the respectful deference with which they were treated w remarked by travellers as a singular exception to the gene imperfection of American male manners, and as in fact tendi to affect inauspiciously the grace of female manners.

When negro slavery began to excite the horror of sensiti minds, it became necessary to re-examine the foundations

ociety and find a theory which would, in asserting the ulti-
nate similarity and equality of all men, condemn the owner-
hip of one man by another. This was done by recurring to
he New Testament and the Declaration of Independence. Two
uestions speedily suggested themselves. If all men of what-
ver race are equal, what of women? If equality be an abso-
ute and, so to speak, indefeasible truth and principle, what
oes it import? Does it cover merely the passive rights of
itizenship, the right to freedom and protection for person
nd property? or does it extend to the active right of par-
cipating in the government of the commonwealth? "We
emand freedom for the negro. Do we also demand a share in
he government? If we do, are not women at least as well
ntitled? If we do not, it is because we see that the negro is
o ignorant and altogether backward as to be unfit to exercise
olitical power. But can this be said of women? The con-
derations which might apply to the case of the liberated
egro do not apply to her, for she is educated and capable.
low, then, can she be excluded?"

This was an abstract way of looking at the matter, because
here had not as yet been any substantial demand by women for
olitical rights. But it was on the basis of abstract right that
hey were proceeding. Theory is potent with those who are
hemselves appealing from an actual state of things to theory
nd general principles. And in this instance a practical turn
as given to the question by the fact that many of the most
alous and helpful workers in the Abolitionist movement were
omen. They showed as much courage in facing obloquy and
en danger in what they deemed a sacred cause as Garrison or
ovejoy. They filled the Abolition societies and flocked to the
bolitionist conventions. They were soon admitted to vote
nd hold office in these organizations. The more timid or con-
rvative members protested, and some seceded. But in an
gressive movement, as in a revolution, those who go farthest
e apt to fare best. The advocates of women's claims were
e bolder spirits who retained the direction of the Anti-Slavery
ovement. The women established their right to share the
rils of the combat and the glories of the victory.

The claim of women to be admitted to the franchise and to
blic office would no doubt have been made sooner or later in

America (as it has been made in England) had there been a anti-slavery agitation. But the circumstances of its origin that agitation have tinged its subsequent course. They investe it in the eyes of one set of persons with a species of consecr tion while providing it with a body of trained workers and a pr cedent inspiring hope and teaching patience. To minds of opposite cast they gave it a flavour of sentimentalism, crotche ness, and of what used to be called in America "radicalism." While the struggle against slavery continued, the question w content to stand back, but since the end of the Civil War an the admission of the negroes to the franchise, it has come to th front, and continues to be actively pressed. There are no woman suffrage societies in most parts of the North and We An annual convention of delegates from these societies is hel which stimulates the local workers and resolves on a plan operations.[2] Proposals for the admission of women to this that species of suffrage are sedulously urged on State legisl tures. In every Congress amendments to the Federal Cons tution recognizing women as voters are submitted. Neith House has so far accepted such an amendment, and the chan of its being passed by three-fourths of the States is at prese very small. Once or twice women have been nominated candidates for the Presidency, though none has ever put out list of presidential electors pledged to support her candidatu

These efforts have borne some fruit, though less than t party counted on thirty years ago. So far as I have been ab to ascertain the present state of the law in the different Stat and Territories of the Union, the political rights of wom stand as follows: —

Up till 1893 the suffrage in elections to the State legislatu and State offices had in one State only, Wyoming, been tended to women, and therefore only in that State have th enjoyed the right of voting in Federal elections. Amer ments to State constitutions purporting to confer this suffra had been passed by the legislature in several States; but t people invariably rejected them, and generally by a decisi

[1] The word "radical," frequently applied outside the sphere of pure p tics, *e.g.* to theology, seems in American use to denote rather a tendency t a party.

[2] The first Women's Convention was held in 1848.

ote. In three Territories, however, the right of voting at egislative elections was given by the legislature of the Terri- ory, and in one of these, Wyoming,[1] it was retained when the Territory received Statehood in 1890. In Utah it was abol- shed by a Federal statute, because thought to be exercised by he Mormon wives at the bidding of their polygamous hus- ands, and thus to strengthen the polygamic party. In Washington Territory the law which conferred it in 1883 was eclared invalid by the courts in 1887, because its nature had ot been properly described in the title, was re-enacted imme- iately afterwards, and was in 1888 again declared invalid by he U. S. Territorial Court, on the ground that the Act of Con- ress organizing the Territorial legislature did not empower it o extend the suffrage to women. In enacting their State Con- titution (1889) the people of Washington pronounced against emale suffrage by a majority of two to one; and a good au- hority declared to me that most of the women were well pleased o lose the privilege. In 1893 the legislature of Colorado sub-

[1] According to Governor Hoyt of Wyoming, woman suffrage was carried here, in 1869, by the arts of one man. His account is as follows: "One large- earted legislator in Wyoming went and talked with other members of the gislature. They smiled. But he got one of the lawyers to help him draw a short bill, which he introduced. It was considered and discussed. People ailed generally. There was not much expectation that anything of that sort ould be done; but this was a shrewd fellow, who managed the party card in ch a way as to get, as he believed, enough votes to carry the measure before was brought to the test. Thus he said to the Democrats: 'We have a Re- ublican Governor and a Democratic Assembly. Now then, if we can carry this ll through the Assembly, and the Governor vetoes it, we shall have made a int, you know; we shall have shown our liberality and lost nothing. But ep still; don't say anything about it.' They promised. He then went to e Republicans and told them that the Democrats were going to support his easure, and that if *they* didn't want to lose capital they had better vote for too. He didn't think there would be enough of them to carry it; but the te would be on record, and thus defeat the game of the other party. And ey likewise agreed to vote for it. So when the bill came to a vote it went ght through! The members looked at each other in astonishment, for they dn't intended to do it, *quite*. Then they laughed, and said it was a good ke, but they had 'got the Governor in a fix.' So the bill went, in the course time, to John A. Campbell, who was then Governor — the first Governor of e Territory of Wyoming — and he promptly signed it! His heart was right!" Address delivered at Philadelphia in 1882. Mr. Horace Plunkett, however, scredits this story, and assigns as the reasons for the passing of the bill the tion that it would serve to advertise Wyoming (which it did) and a sort of ugh Western liking for a joke. (*The Working of Woman Suffrage in Wyo- ing*, Cheyenne, Wyo., 1890.)

mitted to the voters (in virtue of a provision in the Constitution
a law extending full franchise for all purposes to women, an
it was carried by a majority of 6347. This remarkable resu
appears to have been largely due to the breaking up of th
old party organizations by the new People's party, whic
generally favours woman suffrage, and to the action of th
Knights of Labour and other groups of workingmen, amon
whom abstract theories of equality prevail. The example
Wyoming doubtless also told.

In twenty States besides Wyoming and Colorado[1] wome
are allowed to vote at elections of school officers, or on son
question connected with schools; and in several other State
(nine at least), as well as in all or nearly all of these twenty
they may be chosen to fill school offices, such as that of scho
visitor, or superintendent, or member of a school committe
They also enjoy "school suffrage" in the Territory of Arizon
and sporadically in a few cities.

In two States, Arkansas and Mississippi, women have th
right of voting, though not in person, upon the question
granting licences for the sale of intoxicants. A bill to conf
the same right was lost in the Massachusetts legislature
1888 by a majority of one vote only. A similar proposal wa
defeated in the legislature of Iowa in March, 1888.

In Kansas, in 1886, and in Michigan in 1893, women receive
the suffrage in all municipal elections. In Michigan, howeve
the law has since been declared unconstitutional.[2]

In those States where women possess the school suffrage
is reported that few vote; and this is ascribed partly to i
difference, partly to the difficulty which women of the humbl
class experience in leaving their homes to go to the poll.
Minneapolis, a city of 175,000 people, one is told that only tw
or three hundred women usually vote at school elections, an
in Massachusetts the number of women going to the po

[1] Connecticut, North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansa
Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, N
Hampshire, New York, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Washington, Wisco
sin. Women enjoy school and municipal franchise in the Canadian Provinc
of Ontario, Nova Scotia, Manitoba, and British Columbia.

[2] Similar proposals have within the last few years been defeated in a go
many States, though often by small majorities. In several of the smal
cities of Kansas all the municipal offices, from the mayoralty and pol
judgeship downwards, have occasionally been filled by women.

eclined rapidly after the first few years. But at the school lection of 1888 in Boston they voted largely, and in 1893 retty well, carrying one of their candidates; and in Kansas t the municipal election in 1893 a very heavy vote was cast y the female voters.

In Connecticut, the latest State which has extended school ıffrage to women (1893), it would appear that the women ave not, so far, shown much eagerness to be registered. How-ver, while the advanced women leaders and Prohibitionists arted a campaign among the women voters, the husbands nd brothers of conservative proclivities urged their wives and sters to register, and not without success.

In Wyoming (while it was still a Territory) women served as ırors for some months till the judges discovered that they were ot entitled by law to do so, and in Washington (while a Terri-ory) they served from 1884 to 1887, when the legislature, in re-anting the right of voting, omitted to grant the duty or priv-ege of jury service. Those whose opinions I have inquired form me that the presence of women on juries was deemed grave evil, and that in prosecutions for gambling or the sale intoxicants a defendant had no chance before them. It is so stated that comparatively few went to the poll. In Wyoming, moreover, the women on juries are stated to have een more severe than men.

As respects the suffrage in Wyoming, the evidence I have llected privately is conflicting. One of the most trustworthy thorities writes to me as follows: —

"After the first excitement is over, it is impossible to get spectable women out to vote except every two or three years some purely emotional question like Prohibition or other mperance legislation. The effect on family life seems to be *l;* certainly not bad." Another highly competent witness rites: "There are no large towns, Cheyenne, with a popula-on of 9000, being the largest. In the larger places most of e women, who are chiefly married, vote; in the smaller and ore rural places the women take little interest in it, as indeed e men do. As a rule, women are in favour of temperance d good schools, and so far as they have been able to cast eir influence, it has been on the right side in those questions. oman suffrage so far seems to work well, but the field of its

operations is one presenting singular immunity from the evil which elsewhere might attach to it, the population being spars and women in the minority."

Beside these and similar statements may be set the fact tha no opposition was offered in the Convention of 1889, whic drafted the present Constitution, to the enactment of woma suffrage for all purposes. The opinion of the people at larg was not duly ascertained, because the question was not sepa rately submitted to them at the polls, but there can be littl doubt that it would have been favourable. The declarations o Wyoming officials may deserve no great weight, for they do no wish to offend any section of the voters, and every Weste American feels bound to say the best he can and somethin more for the arrangements of his own State. But the whol proceedings of the Convention of 1889 leave the impressio that the equal suffrage in force since 1869 had worked fairl and the summing up of the case by a thoughtful and dispa sionate British observer (Mr. H. Plunkett[1]) is to the sam effect. Moreover, had the results been bad in Wyoming, the would have been quoted against the adoption of the measur by Colorado in 1893. It deserves, however, to be noticed tha in these new Western States women are in a minority. In Wyo ming there were (1890) 21,362 women against 39,343 men, an in Colorado 80,000 more men than women, whereas in Massa chusetts there were 63,000 more women than men.

As regards Washington, a gentleman of standing reside there writes me that "few women took advantage of the ba lot privilege, and most of them were greatly relieved that th responsibility was removed."

No evidence has come in my way tending to show tha politics are in Wyoming — there has been time to test th results in Colorado — or were in Washington substantiall purer than in the adjoining States, though it is said that th polls are quieter. The most that seems to be alleged is tha they are no worse; or, as the Americans express it, "Thing

[1] In the pamphlet already cited. He observes that his informants nev attempted to connect the frequency of divorces in Wyoming with the politic equality of the sexes, conceiving this to have exercised no influence on t family life, nor led to domestic discord. "Political differences constitute o of the few domestic troubles which no State or Territory (so far) recogniz as just cause for dissolution of matrimony."

re very much what they were before, only more so." The onditions of a small and scattered population such as that of Wyoming (60,705 in 1890) render its experience of slight alue for such communities as the Eastern and Middle tates.

Very recently it was proposed in the Convention which is ow (August, 1894) sitting to draft a new Constitution for he State of New York, that a clause granting full suffrage women should be inserted and submitted to the voters. etitions signed by large numbers of women were presented oth for and against the proposal. The Convention, however, a vote of 97 to 58, refused even to submit the question, a sult which is deemed to have seriously discouraged the ovement so far as the Atlantic States are concerned.

Wherever the suffrage or any other public right has been ven, it is given equally to married and to unmarried women.[1] o one dreams of drawing any distinction between the claims the single and the married, or of making marriage entail disanchisement. To do so would be alien to the whole spirit of merican legislation, and would indeed involve a much grosser nomaly or injustice than the exclusion of all women alike from olitical functions. This point, therefore, on which much conoversy has arisen in England, has given no trouble in the nited States: and, similarly, the Americans always assume at wherever women receive the right of voting at the election any office, they become as a matter of course eligible for the fice itself. In some cases eligibility for the office has preceded e gift of the suffrage. There are States in which women ve no school suffrage, but are chosen to school offices; and ates (Massachusetts, for instance) in which they have no te at municipal or State elections, but where they are placed the State Board of Education or the Board of Prison Comssioners. It would be deemed in the last degree illogical to ve women municipal suffrage, and not allow a woman to be osen Mayoress, to give State (and therewith congressional)

[1] In a few States, however (*e.g.* Indiana and Oregon), school suffrage is ited to women who are heads of families, because these only are deemed to interested in respect of children; and in a few (*e.g.* Michigan, Indiana, and egon) there are property qualifications of small amount attached to the ool suffrage in the case of women which are not required in the case of n. In Kentucky school suffrage is granted only to widows who have children.

suffrage and not allow a woman to enter both the State legislature and Congress, to give suffrage at the presidential election and yet disqualify a woman for the Presidency of the United States.[1] And there is nothing now to prevent a woman being elected United States Senator from Wyoming (where five votes out of thirty-five were lately given for a woman candidate) or from Colorado.

"What," it will be asked, "are the forces by which the Woman's Rights movement is now pressed forward? What are the arguments used to support it? Are they of a theoretical or of a practical nature? Is it on the ground of abstract justice and democratic principle that the battle is being fought, or is it alleged that women suffer from positive disabilities and hardships which nothing but an equal share in political power will remove?"

Both sets of arguments are employed; but those of a theoretical order seem to hold the chief place. In all or nearly all States married women have complete rights to their property; in most, mothers have rights considerable, if not quite equal to those of fathers, in the guardianship of their children. Women enjoy the equal protection of the law and are admissible to professions and the training needed for professions, while the laws of divorce, whatever may be said of them in other respects, are not more indulgent to husbands than to wives. Although therefore the advocates of woman suffrage expect some tangible legislative benefits to woman from her admission to the franchise, especially in the way of obtaining better protection for her and for children, the case on this side is not an urgent one, and does not excite much strength of feeling. No one who observes America can doubt that whatever is deemed to be for the real benefit of women in the social and industrial sphere will be obtained for them from the good-will and sympathy of men, without the agency of the political vote. It is on grounds of abstract right, it is because the exclusion from political power is deemed in itself unjust and degrading, and is thought to place woman altogether on

[1] Women are not unfrequently appointed to posts connected with legislative bodies. I found in Washington that they had been chosen to be clerks and messengers to one or other of the Houses of the then Territorial legislature. It appears to have been held in Connecticut that a woman may be appointed pension agent and in Illinois that she may be a master in chancery.

wer level, that this exclusion is so warmly resented. It eems to be believed that a nobler and more vigorous type of omanhood would be developed by the complete recognition her equality, a wider and grander sphere of action opened her efforts. Perhaps the commonest argument is contained the question, "Why not? What reason can you give, you hose forefathers revolted from England because representaon was not suffered to go with taxation, you who annually epeat the Declaration of Independence as if it were the icene Creed, you who twenty-five years ago enfranchised norant negroes, for excluding from the suffrage women who ay taxes, who are within the reason and meaning of the eclaration of 1776, who are far more intellectually and orally competent than the coloured millions of the South?" his appeal, which becomes all the stronger as an *argumentum l hominem* because the American man is exceptionally defertial to women, and the American statesman exceptionally sposed to comply with every request which is urgently essed upon him, is the kernel of the suffragist case. Howver, it derives no small practical aid from a practical considation. The one question of current politics which heartily terests women is the question of restricting or prohibiting e sale of intoxicants. This is also the question which exites not perhaps the widest yet certainly the keenest interest the minds of a great host of male voters. The enemies of e liquor traffic have therefore a strong motive for desiring see their voting power reinforced by those whose aid would cure victory; and in fact Prohibitionist Conventions almost ways declare in favour of woman suffrage. For a different ason, the Socialist and Labour parties, and to a considerable tent the Populists also, are disposed to support it, as indeed e Socialists usually do in Europe also.

Yet it must not be supposed that the sentimental arguments e all on one side. There is a widespread apprehension that bring women into politics might lower their social position, minish men's deference for them, harden and roughen them, d, as it is expressed, "brush the bloom off the flowers." his feeling is at least as strong among women as among men, d some judicious observers think it is stronger now than it as twenty-five years ago. I am inclined to think, though of

course this is mere conjecture, that the proportion of wome
who desire the suffrage is smaller in America than in Englan
Of the many American ladies whose opinion I inquired, th
enormous majority expressed themselves hostile; and there ha
been formed a Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Americ
which conducts an active agitation, whereas in England no sir
ilar organization has been ever created among either men
women. It is remarkable that the movement has in Ameri
found little support among what may be called the "upp
classes." Woman suffragism has been, though perhaps le
so now than formerly, thought "bad form," and supposed
betoken a want of culture and refinement. The same reproa
attached forty years ago to Abolitionism. It has certainly bee
an injury to the cause that some few of its prominent advocate
disavowed no doubt by the great bulk of the suffrage party, ha
also advocated a general unsettlement of the relations betwe
the sexes, and that a few others have been too masculine in the
manners and discourse. The sentimental aversion to seei
women immersed in politics is all the greater, because "po
tics" have a technical meaning which is repellent to refin
Americans; and the practical objection to doubling constitue
cies which are already enormous — a member of Congress rep
sents more than five times as many voters as an English memb
of Parliament — is strongly felt by philosophic publicists. Ev
those who desire to see the sale of intoxicants restricted fe
doubts as to the expediency of attaining their object by t
votes of women, because the difficulty of enforcing prohibito
legislation, already serious where the drinking minority
strong, would be much greater if a majority of men in favo
of keeping bars and saloons open were overborne by a minori
of men turned into a majority by the votes of women.

It is commonly assumed that, in a democratic country,
changes are towards a further extension of the suffrage, th
democratic voters are like the unjust judge in the parable, a
will yield to importunity what they might refuse to justi
in short, that whatever an active section continues to pr
for will sooner or later be conceded. But this assumption m
be too hasty. True it is that so far the agitation for the gra
of suffrage to women has been met by comparatively little
the way of counter agitation, that abstract democratic doctr

as still power over the American mind, that the support of
he Prohibitionist party is an important factor in the problem.
et who can tell whether the movement will evoke as much
nthusiasm during the next thirty years as it has done during
he last thirty? When the group of Abolitionist leaders, already
dly thinned by death, pass finally off the stage, will men and
omen of equal ardour arise to fill their places? Will the
bolitionist spirit, which insisted on giving full political effect
the conception of equal human rights, be as intense in the
ext generation as in that which saw the horrors of slavery?
Vill what may be called, in no disparaging sense, the senti-
ental tendency in politics be as strong then as it is even
-day? The liquor question may possibly be settled, or at
ast so far settled as no longer to dominate politics; and
her questions may come up, thrusting female suffrage into the
ackground. The remarkable progress which the movement
as made in England cheers its American adherents; but it
as some advantages in England which it wants in America.
n England a section of the Liberal party, which is apt to be
he party of theory and sentiment, has favoured it, because
ss afraid of change, and more disposed to admit every one to
olitical power; while the Tory party has latterly much more
nerally, though not universally, favoured it, in the belief that
omen are conservative in their tendencies, and would support
he Established Church and established institutions generally.
has thus had the rare good fortune of drawing support from
oth camps, though for different reasons. But in America
ost of the leaders of both the great parties seem unfriendly
hough the Democrats are more frequently hostile than the
epublicans), perhaps because the introduction of a vast mass
new voters might strain the party machinery, and bring in
incalculable and therefore disagreeable element. Both
rties already dislike the Prohibitionists, because they cut
ross the legitimate party organizations and contests: the
troduction of women would, it is thought, aggravate this
ischief. Some one may say that this ought to commend the
ffrage movement to the Reforming or Independent party,
hich attacks the so-called "Machine Men" of both Republi-
ns and Democrats. In point of fact, however, very few of
e reformers advocate woman suffrage, apparently because

they are opposed to "sentimentalism," and think that "po tics," as now practised, would do more harm to women tha women could possibly do good to politics.

These are some of the reasons which make an imparti observer doubt whether full political suffrage, as distinguishe from school or municipal suffrage, is likely to be granted women in many States of the Union within the next thir years, for of the remoter future it would be rash to spea Still it must be remembered that considerable advances ha been made, and that where any form of suffrage has been on granted it has never, except in Washington and in the whol exceptional case of Utah, been withdrawn. The suffragis have some grounds for the confidence of victory they expre If they can bring the public opinion of women themselves ov to their side, they will succeed. To a European observer t question seems one rather of social than of political mome If he sees no reason to expect an improvement in politics fr the participation of women in elections and their admission Congress and to high political office, neither does he find mu cause for fear. The results of universal suffrage may n greatly differ from those of manhood suffrage. Such misg ings as he entertains are of a different nature. They are se ous misgivings, and they are rendered not less serious by study of the social changes which are passing upon the wo in Europe as well as in America.

CHAPTER XCVII

THE SUPPOSED FAULTS OF DEMOCRACY

The question which in one form or another every European
litician has during the last half-century been asking about
e United States, is the broad question, How does democracy
swer? No other country has tried the experiment of a
mocratic government on so large a scale, with so many
inor variations, for the State governments are forty-four
tonomous democracies, or with such advantages of geo-
aphical position and material resources. And those who
ink that all civilized countries are moving towards democ-
cy, even though they may not be destined to rest there,
d the question an important one for themselves. The reader
ho has followed thus far the account I have tried to give of
e Federal Constitution and its working, of the State Consti-
ions, of local government, of the party machinery, of the
luence of public opinion as a controlling power over all the
stitutions of the country, will be content with a compara-
ely brief summary of the results to which the inquiries
de under these heads point.

That summary naturally falls into three parts. We have to
k first, how far the faults usually charged on democracy are
esent in America; next, what are the special faults which
aracterize it there; last, what are the strong points which it
s developed.

The chief faults which philosophers, from Plato downwards
Mr. Robert Lowe, and popular writers repeating and carica-
ing the dicta of philosophers, have attributed to democratic
vernments, are the following: —

Weakness in emergencies, incapacity to act with prompti-
le and decision.

Fickleness and instability, frequent changes of opinion, con-

sequent changes in the conduct of affairs and in executive officials.

Insubordination, internal dissensions, disregard of authority with a frequent resort to violence, bringing on an anarchy which ends in military tyranny.

A desire to level down, and an intolerance of greatness.

Tyranny of the majority over the minority.

A love of novelty: a passion for changing customs and destroying old institutions.

Ignorance and folly, producing a liability to be deceived and misled; consequent growth of demagogues playing on the passions and selfishness of the masses.

I do not say that this list exhausts the reproaches directed against democracy, but it includes those which are most often heard and are best worth examining. Most of them are drawn from the history of the Greek republics of antiquity and the Italian republics of the Middle Ages, small communities where the conditions of social and political life were so different from those of a great modern country that we ought not to expect similar results to follow from political arrangements called by the same name. However, as this consideration has not prevented writers and statesmen, even in our own day, from repeating the old censures, and indeed from mixing together in one repulsive potion all the faults that belonged to small aristocratic republics with all that can belong to large democratic republics, it is worth while to examine these current notions, and try them by the light of the facts which America furnishes.

Weakness and want of Promptitude. — The American democracy is long-suffering and slow in rousing itself; it is often perplexed by problems, and seems to grope blindly for their solution. In the dealings with England and France which preceded the war of A.D. 1812, and in the conduct of that war, its government showed some irresolution and sluggishness. The habit of blustering in its intercourse with foreign powers, and the internal strife over slavery, led Europeans to think it lacked firmness and vigour. They were undeceived in 186[illegible]. While it seemed possible to avert a breach with the Southern slave-holders, the North was willing to accept, and did accept a series of compromises whose inadequacy was soon revealed

he North was ill led in Congress, and the South was boldly not wisely led. Yet when the crisis arrived, the North put orth its power with a suddenness and resolution which surrised the world. There was no faltering in the conduct of a truggle which for two long years French and English statesmen eemed hopeless. The best blood of the North freely offered self to be shed on the battlefields of Virginia and Pennsylvaia for the sake of the Union; while an enormous debt was ncurred in equipping army after army. As every one knows, he Southern people displayed no less vigour even when the de had evidently begun to turn against them, and the hope f European intervention died away. If want of force, dash, nd courage in moments of danger is a defect generally chargeble on popular governments, it was not then chargeable on he United States. But the doctrine is one which finds little support it either in ancient or in modern history, while here are many instances to the contrary: witness the war of he Swiss against Charles the Bold, and the defence of Florence gainst Charles the Fifth.

Fickleness and Instability. — The indictment fails on this ount also. The people are open to sudden impulses, and in rticular States there have been ill-considered innovations nd a readiness to try wild experiments, such as those I have escribed in California. But taking the nation as a whole, its haracter is marked by tenacity of beliefs and adherence to aders once chosen. The opposite charge of stubbornness in fusing to be convinced by argument and to admit the failings men who have established some title to gratitude, might ore plausibly be preferred. Western farmers have been customed to suffer from the high price of the clothes they ear and the implements they use, but once imbibed the belief at a protective tariff makes for the general good of the untry they remained protectionists down till 1890; and many hong them remain so still. The blunders of President Grant's st administration, and the misdeeds of the knot of men who rrounded him, playing upon the political inexperience of a unt soldier, scarcely affected the loyalty of the masses to e man whose sword had saved the Union. Congressmen d State officials are no doubt often changed, but they are anged in pursuance of a doctrine and a habit in which the

interests of a class are involved, not from any fickleness i the people.[1]

Insubordination and Contempt for Authority. — On this hea the evidence is more conflicting. There are States, and cities in which the laws are imperfectly enforced. Homicide i hardly a crime in some parts of the South — that is to say, man who kills another is not always arrested, often not con victed when arrested and put on his trial, very rarely hange when convicted.[2] One might almost say that private war i recognized by opinion in these districts, as it was in Europ during the earlier Middle Ages. In the mountainous countr of Eastern Kentucky, and the adjoining parts of Virginia an Tennessee, quarrels are kept up from generation to generatio between hostile families and their respective friends, whic the State authorities cannot succeed in repressing. In 1890, was assured when passing the borders of that region, that i one such blood feud more than fifty persons had perishe within the preceding ten years, each murder provoking anothe in revenge. When a judge goes into these parts it has som times befallen that a party of men come down fully armed fro the mountains, surround the court house, and either drive hi away or oblige him to abandon the attempt to do justice o slayers belonging to their faction. In the West, again, partic larly in such South-western States as Missouri, Arkansas, an Texas, brigandage seems to be regarded with a certain amus ment, rising into sympathy, by a part of the peaceable pop lation. Having arisen partly out of the Border ruffianism whic preceded the outbreak of the Civil War, partly among men wh were constantly engaged in skirmishing with the Indian tribe there is a flavour of romance about it, which ceases to gild th exploits of train-robbers only when their activity threatens th commercial interests of a rising city. Jesse James, the noto

[1] See Chap. XX. in Vol. I.

[2] Murder is not dealt with quite firmly enough even in some of the Northe States. "There is no subject within the domain of legislation in whi improvement is so needed as in the law against murder. The practical i munity that crime enjoys in some sections of the country, and the dela difficulty, and uncertainty in enforcing the law almost everywhere, is a r proach to our civilization. Efforts to save assassins from punishment are strenuous, the chances of escape so numerous, and the proceedings so pr tracted, that the law has few terrors for those disposed to violate it." Address of Mr. E. J. Phelps to the American Bar Association, 1881.

us bandit of Missouri, and his brothers, were popular heroes
n the region they infested, much like Robin Hood and Little
ohn in the ballads of the thirteenth century in England.
hese phenomena are, however, explicable by other causes than
emocratic government. The homicidal habits of the South
re a relic of that semi-barbarism which slavery kept alive long
fter the northern free States had reached the level of Euro-
ean order. The want of a proper police is apparently the
ause answerable for the numerous train-robberies. Even in
uch States as Illinois and Ohio, robberies occur, which are de-
ected and punished more frequently by the energy of the rail-
oad or express (parcel delivery) companies and their skilled
etectives than through the action of the State authorities.
rigandage is due to the absence of a mounted gendarmerie in
ne vast and thinly peopled Further West, and there is no
endarmerie because the Federal government leaves the States
nd Territories to create their own, and these unsettled com-
unities, being well armed, prefer to take care of themselves
ather than spend their scanty corporate funds on a task whose
ost would, as they think, be disproportionate to the result.[1] In
ne western wilds of Canada, however, the mounted police secures
erfect safety for wayfarers and train-robberies seem to be
nknown.

Lynch law is not unknown in more civilized regions, such
s Indiana and (more rarely) Ohio. A case occurred recently
ot far from New York City. Now lynch law, however shock-
g it may seem to Europeans and New Englanders, is far
moved from arbitrary violence. According to the testimony
careful observers, it is not often abused, and its proceedings
e generally conducted with some regularity of form as well
fairness of spirit. What are the circumstances? Those
ghly technical rules of judicial procedure and still more
chnical rules of evidence which America owes to the English
mmon law, and which have in some States retained anti-
uated minutiæ now expunged from English practice, or been
ndered by new legislation too favourable to prisoners, have
be applied in districts where population is thin, where
ere are very few officers, either for the apprehension of

[1] There is always a sheriff, whose business it is to pursue criminals, and
ng them if convicted, but much depends on his individual vigour.

offenders, or for the hunting up of evidence against them and where, according to common belief, both judges and juries are occasionally "squared" or "got at." Many crimes would go unpunished if some more speedy and efficient method of dealing with them were not adopted. This method is found in a volunteer jury, summoned by the leading local citizens, or in very clear cases, by a simple seizure and execution of the criminal.[1] Why not create an efficient police? Because crime is uncommon in many districts — in such districts, for instance, as Michigan or rural Wisconsin — and the people have deliberately concluded that it is cheaper and simpler to take the law into their own hands on those rare occasions when police is needed than to be at the trouble of organizing and paying a force for which there is usually no employment. If it be urged that they are thus forming habits of lawlessness in themselves, the Americans reply that experience does not seem to make this probable, because lawlessness does not increase among the farming population, and has disappeared from places where the rudeness or simplicity of society formerly rendered lynch law necessary. Cases however occur for which no such excuse can be offered, cases in which a prisoner (probably a negro) already in the hands of justice is seized and put to death by a mob. And within the last few years there has been in several States, and notably in parts of Southern Indiana, — a high, rough, wooded country, with a backward and scattered population, — a strange recrudescence of lynching in the rise of the so-called White Caps, people who seize by night men or women who have given offence by their immoral life or other vices, drag them into the woods, flog them severely, and warn them to quit the neighbourhood forthwith. The legislature of Indiana has been considering a plan for checking this practice by making the county in which such an outrage occurs liable in damages to the person maltreated. Similar outrages are often reported from other States to the south-west of Indiana, as far as Mississippi. In Ohio they were promptly repressed by an energetic governor.

[1] The savageness which occasionally appears in these lynchings is surprising to one who knows the general kindliness of the American people. Not long ago the people of East Kentucky hunted for a murderer to burn him to death, and the White Cap outrages are sometimes accompanied by revolting cruelty.

The so-called "Molly Maguire" conspiracy, which vexed d terrified Pennsylvania for several years, showed the want a vigorous and highly trained police. A sort of secret ciety organized a succession of murders, much like the alian Camorra, which remained undetected till a daring an succeeded in persuading the conspirators to admit him nong them. He shared their schemes, and learnt to know eir persons and deeds, then turned upon them and brought em to justice. This remarkable case illustrates not any glect of law or tenderness for crime, but mainly the power a combination which can keep its secrets. Once detected, e Molly Maguires were severely dealt with. The Pittsburg ts of 1877, and the Cincinnati riots of 1884, alarmed the nericans themselves, so long accustomed to domestic tran-illity as to have forgotten those volcanic forces which lie ouldering in all ignorant masses, ready to burst forth upon fficient excitement. The miners and ironworkers of the ttsburg district are rough fellows, many of them recent migrants who have not yet acquired American habits of der; nor would there have been anything to distinguish this nnsylvanian disturbance from those which happen during ikes in England, as, for instance, at Blackburn, some years o, and during the recent coal strike at one or two places in rkshire and Derbyshire, or in times of distress in France, at Decazeville in 1886, had it been promptly suppressed. nfortunately there was no proper force on the spot. The vernor was absent; the mayor and other local authorities t their heads; the police, feebly handled, were overpowered; militia showed weakness; so that the riot spread in a way ich surprised its authors, and the mob raged for several rs along the railroads in several States, and over a large a of manufacturing and mining towns.

The moral of this event was the necessity, even in a land of edom, of keeping a force strong enough to repress tumults their first stage. The Cincinnati riot began in an attempt lynch two prisoners who were thought likely to escape the nishment they richly deserved; and it would probably have led there had not the floating rabble of this city of 300,000 abitants seized the opportunity to do a little pillage and ke a great noise on their own account. Neither sedition

had any political character, nor indeed any specific obje
except that the Pennsylvanian mob showed special enmity
the railroad company.

Still more recently (1892) the same moral has been enforc
by the strike riots on some of the railroads in New Yo
State and in the mining regions of Idaho, by the local wa
between cattlemen and "rustlers" in Wyoming, by the distu
ances at the Homestead works in Pennsylvania, and by t
sanguinary conflict which arose at the convict-worked mi
in Tennessee, where a mob of miners attacked the stockad
in which were confined convicts kept at labour under contra
between the State and private mine-owners, liberated many
the convicts, captured and were on the point of hanging
officer of the State militia, and were with difficulty at l
repressed by a strong militia force. Such tumults are
specially products of democracy, but they are unhappily pro
that democracy does not secure the good behaviour of its wo
and newest citizens, and that it must be prepared, no less th
other governments, to maintain order by the prompt and st
application of physical force.[1]

It is a regrettable evidence of the extent to which pub
authorities have seemed to abnegate the function of ma
taining order that the habit has grown up among railro
directors and the owners of other large enterprises of hir
a private armed force to protect, at the time of a strike,
only the workmen they bring in to replace the strikers,
also their yards, works, and stock in trade. A firm wh
began business as a private detective agency has for years p
been accustomed to supply for this purpose bodies of men w
trained and drilled, who can be relied on to defend the pl
allotted to them against a greatly superior force of riote
This firm keeps not less than one thousand men permaner
on a war footing, and sends them hither and thither over
country to its customers. They are usually sworn in as S
iff's deputies, on each occasion before the proper local author
So frequent has been the employment of "Pinkerton's men,"

[1] There is a great difference between different States and cities as reg
police arrangements. The police of New York City are efficient and in
somewhat too promptly severe in the use of their staves; and in many c
the police are armed with revolvers.

ey are called (though it is not always from Messrs. Pinkerton Chicago that they are obtained, and the name, like Delmon-, seems to be passing from a proper into a common noun), at some new State constitutions (*e.g.* Wyoming, Idaho, ontana, Washington, Kentucky) and statutes in other States g. Massachusetts) expressly prohibit the bringing of armed n into the State, and a Committee of Congress has recently en investigating the subject, so far without result, for it is ng a long way to forbid a man by statute to hire persons help him to protect his property when he finds it in danger, hough bills with this object have been introduced into State islatures. These strike cases are of course complicated by e fear of a State governor or a mayor to make himself or his cty unpopular by taking strong measures against a crowd o have votes. Here we touch a difficulty specially incident a directly elected Executive, — a difficulty noted already in e cases of elected judges and elected tax-officers, and one ich must be taken into account in striking the balance be-een the good and the evil of a system of direct and pervading pular control. The remedy is doubtless to be sought, and l in extreme cases be found, in the displeasure of the good izens, who, after all, form the voting majority. But it is emedy which may follow with too tardy steps. Meantime, ny large employers of labour find themselves obliged to fend their property by these condottieri, because they cannot y on the defence which the State ought to furnish, and the dottieri themselves, who seem to be generally men of good racter as well as proved courage, are so much hated by the rkmen as to be sometimes in danger of being lynched when nd alone or in small parties.[1]

One hears in some States of laws which are systematically ded, sometimes by the connivance of officials who are im-perly induced to abstain from prosecuting transgressors, metimes with the general consent of the community which ceives that they cannot be enforced. Thus some years ago laws against the sale of liquor on Sundays in the city of icago were not enforced. The bulk of the population, being

[1] It is probably this popular hostility to the employment of Pinkerton's men, ulated by the collision at Homestead, that has caused them to figure but e in the most recent strike troubles.

German and Irish, disliked them, and showed its dislike turning out of the municipal offices those who had enfor them, while yet the law remained on the statute-book becau according to the Constitution of Illinois (one of the m experimental of the newer constitutions, as appears from adoption of minority voting), it takes a majority of two-thi in the legislature to repeal an Act; and the rural memb being largely Prohibitionists, stand by this law against Sun dealing. When in Texas I heard of the same thing as happ ing in the city of San Antonio, and doubt not that it occ in many cities. More laws are quietly suffered to be bro in America than in England, France, or Germany. On the ot hand, it is fair to say that the credit which the Americ claim of being pre-eminently a law-abiding people is borne by the general security of property and person which, ap from the cases of strikes, mentioned above, the trave remarks over the East, most of the Middle States, and more thickly peopled parts of the West.[1] Political distu ances are practically unknown outside some few of the South States, where there are occasional collisions between wh and negroes, nor are they frequent or virulent in those Sta Even when an election is believed to have been fraudule won, the result is respected, because it is externally regu Fights seldom occur at elections; neither party disturbs meetings or processions of the other in the hottest presi tial campaign. Such a series of disturbances as London Lancashire saw in the beginning of 1882, when the meeti of a number of members of Parliament with their constitue were broken up by Irishmen, or party opponents masquerad as Irishmen, or such another series as marked the close of agitation on the Franchise Bill in 1884, excites the wonde Americans, who ask whether Englishmen can be fit for government when they have not yet learnt to let their op nents meet and talk in peace.

The habit of obedience to constituted authority is anot test, and one which Plato would have considered specially conclusive. The difficulty of applying it in America is that th

[1] There is little use in comparing the aggregate of crimes reported ar convictions with the aggregates of European countries, because in disor regions many crimes go unreported as well as unpunished.

so few officials who come into the relation of command
h the people, or in other words, that the people are so lit-
"governed," in the French or German sense, that one has
opportunities of discovering how they comport themselves.
e officers of both the Federal and the State governments, in
ying taxes and carrying out the judgments of the Courts,
re seldom any resistance to fear, except in such regions as
se already referred to, where the fierce mountaineers will not
ok interference with their vendetta, or suffer the Federal
isemen to do their duty. These regions are, however,
te exceptional, forming a sort of *enclave* of semi-barbarism
a civilized country, such as the rugged Albania was in the
nan Empire. Other authorities experience no difficulty in
xing themselves respected. A railroad company, for in-
nce, finds its passengers only too submissive. They endure
h a patience which astonishes Englishmen frequent irregu-
ties of the train service and other discomforts, which
ld in England produce a whole crop of letters to the news-
ers. The discipline of the army and navy in the war was
rly as strict as in European armies. So in universities
colleges discipline is maintained with the same general
e and the same occasional troubles as arise in Oxford and
nbridge. The children in the city schools are proverbially
ile. Except when strikes occur, employers do not complain
ny trouble in keeping order among their workpeople while
ork. So far, indeed, is insubordination from being a char-
ristic of the native Americans, that they are conspicuously
one free people of the world which, owing to its superior
lligence, has recognized the permanent value of order, and
erves it on every occasion, not least when a sudden alarm
es. Anarchy is of all dangers or bugbears the one which
modern world has least cause to fear, for the tendency of
nary human nature to obey is the same as in past times,
the aggregation of human beings into great masses weakens
force of the individual will, and makes men more than
like sheep, so far as action is concerned. Much less,
efore, is there ground for fancying that out of anarchy
e will grow any tyranny of force. Whether democracies
not end in yielding greater power to their executives is
e another question, whereof more anon; all I observe here

is that in no country can a military despotism, such as t which has twice prevailed in France and once in England deemed less likely to arise. During the Civil War there w many persons in Europe cultivating, as Gibbon says, the na without the temper of philosophy, who predicted that s successful leader of the Northern armies would establish throne on the ruins of the Constitution. But no sooner General Lee surrendered at Appomatox than the disbandm of the victorious host began; and the only thing which th after distinguished Generals Grant, Sherman, and Sheri from their fellow-citizens was the liability to have "re tions" forced on them when they visited a city, and find t puissant arms wearied by the handshakings of their enth astic admirers.

Cæsarism is the last danger likely to menace America. no nation is civil order more stable. None is more avers the military spirit. No political system would offer a gre resistance to an attempt to create a standing army or centra the administration.

Jealousy of Greatness, and a Desire to Level Down.—T charge derives a claim to respectful consideration from authority of Tocqueville, who thought it a necessary attri of democracy, and professed to have discovered symptoms in the United States. It alarmed J. S. Mill, and has been quently dwelt on by his disciples, and by many who adopted no other part of his teachings, as an evil equally in able and fatal in democratic countries. There was prob good ground for it sixty years ago. Even now one discove tendency in the United States, particularly in the Wes dislike, possibly to resent, any outward manifestation of s superiority. A man would be ill looked upon who should b a castle in a park, surround his pleasure-grounds with a wall, and receive an exclusive society in gilded saloons. O the parts which prominent politicians, who must be assume know their business, most like to play is the part of Cincinn at the plough, or Curius Dentatus receiving the Samnite en over his dinner of turnips. They welcome a newspaper i viewer at their modest farm, and take pains that he sh describe how simply the rooms are furnished, and how "help" (*i.e.* how few servants) is kept Although the cyni

e New York press make a mock of such artless ways, the sired impression is produced on the farmer and the artisan. a senatorial election not long ago in a North-western State, e opponents of the sitting candidate procured a photograph his residence in Washington, a handsome mansion in a fash- able avenue, and circulated it among the members of the ate legislature, to show in what luxury their Federal repre- ntative indulged. I remember to have heard it said of a tesman proposing to become a candidate for the Presidency, t he did not venture during the preceding year to occupy house in Washington, lest he should give occasion for simi- criticism. Whether or not this was his real motive, the ribution of it to him is equally illustrative. But how little wealthy fear to display their wealth and take in public the asures it procures may be understood by any one who, walk- down Fifth Avenue in New York, observes the superb ses which line it, houses whose internal decorations and lected objects of art rival those of the palaces of European les, or who watches in Newport, the most fashionable of nsatlantic watering-places, the lavish expenditure upon ser- ts, horses, carriages, and luxuries of every kind. No spot Europe conveys an equal impression of the lust of the eyes the pride of life, of boundless wealth and a boundless ire for enjoyment, as does the Ocean Drive at Newport on afternoon in August.

ntellectual eminence excites no jealousy, though it is more nired and respected than in Europe. The men who make at fortunes, such as the late Mr. A. T. Stewart, or "Commo- e" Vanderbilt, are not regarded with suspicion or envy, but ner with admiration. "When thou doest good unto thyself, men shall speak well of thee." Wealth does not, as in Eng- d, give its possessors an immediate *entrée* to fashionable ety, but it marks them as the heroes and leaders of commercial world, and sets them on a pinnacle of fame ch fires the imagination of ambitious youths in dry goods es or traffic clerks on a railroad. The demonstrations of tility to wealthy "monopolists," and especially to rail- d companies, made in some districts, are prompted, not hatred to prominence or wealth, but by discontent at the nense power which capitalists exercise, especially in the

business of transporting goods, and which they have f
quently abused.

Tyranny of the Majority. — Of this I have spoken in a pre
ous chapter, and need only summarize the conclusions th
arrived at. So far as compulsive legislation goes, it has ne
been, and is now less than ever, a serious or widespread e
The press is free to advocate unpopular doctrines, even
most brutal forms of anarchism. Religious belief and practi
are untouched by law. The sale of intoxicants is no doubt
many places restricted or forbidden, but to assume that this
a tyrannical proceeding is to beg a question on which the w
are much divided. The taxation of the rich for the benefit
the poor offers the greatest temptation to a majority dispo
to abuse its powers. But neither Congress nor the State leg
latures have, with a very few exceptions, gone any farther
this direction than the great nations of Europe. I may be t
that this abstention from legislative tyranny is due, not to
wisdom and fairness of the American democracy, but to
restraints which the Federal and State constitutions imp
upon it. These restraints do, no doubt, exist. But who
pose and maintain them? The people themselves, who sur
deserve the credit of desiring to remove from their own p
temptations which might occasionally prove irresistible. It
true that the conditions have been in some points exceptiona
favourable. Class hatreds are absent. The two great natio
parties are not class parties. Taking the whole country, r
and poor are equally represented in both of these parti
Neither proposes to overtax the rich. Both denounce mon
olism in the abstract, and promise to restrain capital fr
abusing its power, but neither is more forward than the ot
to take practical steps for such a purpose, because each inclu
capitalists whose contributions the party needs, and e
equally leans upon the respectable and wealthy classes, —
Republicans more particularly on those classes in the No
the Democrats on the same classes in the South. Party d
sions do not coincide with social or religious divisions, as
often happened in Europe.

Moreover, in State politics — and it is in the State rat
than in the Federal sphere that attacks on a minority mi
be feared — the lines on which parties act are fixed by

nes which separate the national parties, and each party is herefore held back from professing doctrines which menace ne interests of any class. The only exceptions occur where me burning economic question supersedes for the moment ne regular party attachments. This happened in California, ith the consequences already described. It came near hapening in two or three of the North-western States, such as llinois and Wisconsin, where the farmers, organized in their ranges or agricultural clubs, caused the legislatures to pass atutes which bore hardly on the railroads and the owners of levators and grain warehouses. Similar attempts have been ore recently made by the so-called Populists. Yet even this ind of legislation can scarcely be called tyrannical. It is an ttempt, however clumsy and abrupt, to deal with a real ecomical mischief, not an undue extension of the scope of legistion to matters in which majorities ought not to control inorities at all.

Love of Novelty; Passion for destroying Old Institutions. — It easy to see how democracies have been credited with this ndency. They have risen out of oligarchies or aristocratic onarchies, the process of their rise coinciding, if not always ith a revolution, at least with a breaking down of many old ages and institutions. It is this very breaking down that ves birth to them. Probably some of the former institutions e spared, are presently found incompatible with the new order things, and then have to be changed till the people has, so speak, furnished its house according to its taste. But when e new order has been established, is there any ground for lieving that a democracy is an exception to the general tenncy of mankind to adhere to the customs they have formed, lmire the institutions they have created, and even bear the s they know rather than incur the trouble of finding some ay out of them? The Americans are not an exception. They lue themselves only too self-complacently on their methods government; they abide by their customs, because they mire them. They love novelty in the sphere of amusent, literature, and social life; but in serious matters, such the fundamental institutions of government and in reious belief, no progressive and civilized people is more nservative.

Liability to be misled; Influence of Demagogues. — No dou the inexperience of the recent immigrants, the want of train political thought among the bulk even of native citizens, t tendency to sentimentalism which marks all large masses men, do lay the people open to the fallacious reasoning a specious pursuasions of adventurers. This happens in all pop larly governed countries; and a phenomenon substantially t same occurs in oligarchies, for you may have not only aris cratic demagogues, but demagogues playing to an aristocra mob. Stripped of its externals and considered in its essent features, demagogism is no more abundant in America than England, France, or Italy. Empty and reckless declaime such as are some of those who have figured in the Grang and Populist movements (for sincere and earnest men ha shared in both), are allowed to talk themselves hoarse, a ultimately relapse into obscurity. A demagogue of great talent may aspire to some high executive office; if not to t Presidency, then perhaps to a place in the Cabinet, where may practically pull the wires of a President whom he h put into the chair. Failing either of these, he aims at t governorship of his State or the mayoralty of a great ci In no one of these positions is it easy for him to do pern nent mischief. The Federal executive has no influence legislation, and even in foreign policy and in the making appointments requires the consent of the Senate. That a man should acquire so great a hold on the country as to secu the election of two Houses of Congress subservient to his wi while at the same time securing the Presidency or Secreta ship of State for himself, is an event too improbable to ent into calculation. Nothing approaching it has been seen sin the days of Jackson. The size of the country, the differenc between the States, a hundred other causes, make achievemer possible enough in a European country all but impossible he That a plausible adventurer should clamber to the president chair, and when seated there should conspire with a corru congressional ring, purchasing by the gift of offices and jobs their support for his own schemes of private cupidity public mischief, is conceivable, but improbable. The syst of counter-checks in the Federal government, which impe or delays much good legislation, may be relied on to av

any of the dangers to which the sovereign chambers of Euro-ean countries are exposed.

A demagogue installed as governor of a State — and it is sually in State politics that demagogism appears — has but mited opportunities for wrong-doing. He can make a few d appointments, and can discredit the commonwealth by idignified acts. He cannot seriously harm it. Two politi-ans who seem to deserve the title recently obtained that onourable post in two great Eastern States. One of them, a pical "ringster," perpetrated some jobs, tampered with some ections, and vetoed some good bills. Venturing too far, he at st involved his party in an ignominious defeat. The other, a an of greater natural gifts and greater capacity for mischief, hose capture of the chief magistracy of the State had drawn rth lamentations from the better citizens, left things much he found them, and the most noteworthy incident which arked his year of office — for he was turned out at the next ection — was the snub administered by the leading university the State, which refused him the compliment, usually paid the chief magistrate, of an honorary degree of Doctor of aws.

This inquiry has shown us that of the faults traditionally tributed to democracy one only is fairly chargeable on the nited States; that is to say, is manifested there more con-icuously than in the constitutional monarchies of Europe. his is the disposition to be lax in enforcing laws disliked by y large part of the population, to tolerate breaches of public der, and to be too indulgent to offenders generally. The mericans themselves admit this to be one of their weak ints. How far it is due to that deficient reverence for law hich is supposed to arise in popular governments from the ct that the people have nothing higher than themselves to ok up to, how far to the national easy-goingness and good-ture, how far to the prejudice against the maintenance of adequate force of military and police and to the optimism hich refuses to recognize the changes brought by a vast crease of population, largely consisting of immigrants, these e points I need not attempt to determine. It has produced general disposition to lawlessness, which rather tends to minish in the older parts of the country. And it is some-

times (though not always) replaced in a serious crisis by firmness in repressing disorders which some European gover ments may envy. Men who are thoroughly awakened to t need for enforcing the law, enforce it all the more resolute because it has the whole weight of the people behind it.

CHAPTER XCVIII

THE TRUE FAULTS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

We have seen that the defects commonly attributed to demo-atic government are not specially characteristic of the United tates. It remains to inquire what are the peculiar blemishes hich the country does show. So far as regards the constitu-onal machinery of the Federal and of the State government is question has been answered in earlier chapters. It is ow rather the tendency of the institutions generally, the dis-osition and habits of the governing people, that we have to nsider. The word Democracy is often used to mean a spirit tendency, sometimes the spirit of revolution, sometimes the irit of equality. For our present purpose it is better to ke it as denoting simply a form of government, that in which e numerical majority rules, deciding questions of state by e votes, whether directly, as in the ancient republics, or diately, as in modern representative government, of the dy of citizens, the citizens being if not the whole, at least a ry large proportion of the adult males. The inquiry may gin with the question, What are the evils to which such a rm of government is by its nature exposed? and may then oceed to ascertain whether any other defects exist in the ited States government which, though traceable to democ-y, are not of its essence, but due to the particular form ich it has there taken.

It is an old maxim that republics live by Virtue — that is, the maintenance of a high level of public spirit and justice ong the citizens. If the republic be one in which power is nfined to, or practically exercised by, a small educated class, e maintenance of this high level is helped by the sense personal dignity which their position engenders. If the ublic itself be small, and bear rule over others, patriotism

may be intense, and the sense of the collective dignity of t
state may ennoble the minds of the citizens, make them wi
ing to accept sacrifices for its sake, to forego private interes
and suppress private resentments, in order to be strong again
the outer world. But if the state be very large, and the righ
of all citizens equal, we must not expect them to rise abo
the average level of human nature. Rousseau and Jeffers
will tell us that this level is high, that the faults which go
ernments have hitherto shown are due to the selfishness
privileged persons and classes, that the ordinary unsophis
cated man will love justice, desire the good of others, need
constraint to keep him in the right path. Experience w
contradict them, and whether it talks of Original Sin or adop
some less scholastic phrase, will recognize that the tendenc
to evil in human nature are not perhaps as strong, but as va
ous and abiding even in the most civilized societies, as
impulses to good. Hence the rule of numbers means the r
of ordinary mankind, without those artificial helps which th
privileged position has given to limited governing class
though also, no doubt, without those special temptations whi
follow in the wake of power and privilege.

Since every question that arises in the conduct of gove
ment is a question either of ends or of means, errors may
committed by the ruling power either in fixing on wrong en
or in choosing wrong means to secure those ends. It is no
after long resistance by those who maintained that they kn
better what was good for the people than the people kn
themselves, at last agreed that as the masses are better judg
of what will conduce to their own happiness than are the clas
placed above them, they must be allowed to determine en
This is in fact the essence of free or popular government, a
the justification for vesting power in numbers. But assum
the end to be given, who is best qualified to select the mea
for its accomplishment? To do so needs in many cases
knowledge of the facts, a skill in interpreting them, a pow
of forecasting the results of measures, unattainable by
mass of mankind. Such knowledge is too high for them.
is attainable only by trained economists, legists, statesm
If the masses attempt it they will commit mistakes not l
serious than those which befall a litigant who insists on c

ducting a complicated case instead of leaving it to his attorney and counsel. But in popular governments this distinction between ends and means is apt to be forgotten. Often it is one which cannot be sharply drawn, because some ends are means to larger ends, and some means are desired not only for the sake of larger ends, but for their own sakes also. And the habit of trusting its own wisdom and enjoying its own power, in which the multitude is encouraged by its leaders and servants, disposes it to ignore the distinction even where the distinction is clear, and makes it refer to the direct arbitrament of the people matters which the people are unfit to decide, and which they might safely leave to their trained ministers or representatives. Thus we find that the direct government of the multitude may become dangerous not only because the multitude shares the faults and follies of ordinary human nature, but also because it is intellectually incompetent for the delicate business of conducting the daily work of administration, *i.e.* of choosing and carrying out with vigour and promptitude the requisite executive means. The People, though we think of a great entity when we use the word, means nothing more than so many millions of individual men. There is a sense in which it is true that the people are wiser than the wisest man. But what is true of their ultimate judgment after the lapse of time sufficient for full discussion, is not equally true of decisions that have to be promptly taken.

What are the consequences which we may expect to follow from these characteristics of democracy and these conditions under which it is forced to work?

First, a certain commonness of mind and tone, a want of dignity and elevation in and about the conduct of public affairs, an insensibility to the nobler aspects and finer responsibilities of national life.

Secondly, a certain apathy among the luxurious classes and fastidious minds, who find themselves of no more account than the ordinary voter, and are disgusted by the superficial vulgarities of public life.

Thirdly, a want of knowledge, tact, and judgment in the details of legislation, as well as in administration, with an inadequate recognition of the difficulty of these kinds of work,

and of the worth of special experience and skill in deali with them. Because it is incompetent, the multitude will n feel its incompetence, and will not seek or defer to the cou sels of those who possess the requisite capacity.

Fourthly, laxity in the management of public business. T persons entrusted with such business being only average me thinking themselves and thought of by others as average me and not rising to a due sense of their responsibilities, may su cumb to the temptations which the control of legislation a the public funds present, in cases where persons of a mo enlarged view and with more of a social reputation to suppo would remain incorruptible. To repress such derelictions duty is every citizen's duty, but for that reason it is in lar communities apt to be neglected. Thus the very causes whi implant the mischief favour its growth.

The above-mentioned tendencies are all more or less obser ble in the United States. As each of them has been describ already in its proper place, a summary reference may here sufficient to indicate their relation to the democratic form government and to the immanent spirit or theory which li behind that form.

The tone of public life is lower than one expects to find in so great a nation. Just as we assume that an individu man will at any supreme moment in his own life rise to higher level than that on which he usually moves, so we lo to find those who conduct the affairs of a great state inspir by a sense of the magnitude of the interests entrusted to the Their horizon ought to be expanded, their feeling of du quickened, their dignity of attitude enhanced. Human natu with all its weaknesses does show itself capable of being th roused on its imaginative side; and in Europe, where t traditions of aristocracy survive, everybody condemns as me or unworthy acts done or language held by a great offic which would pass unnoticed in a private citizen. It is t principle of *noblesse oblige* with the sense of duty and tr substituted for that of mere hereditary rank.

Such a sentiment is comparatively weak in America. cabinet minister, or senator, or governor of a State, sometin even a President, hardly feels himself more bound by it th the director of a railway company or the mayor of a town d

n Europe. Not assuming himself to be individually wiser, tronger, or better than his fellow-citizens, he acts and speaks s though he were still simply one of them, and so far from nagnifying his office and making it honourable, seems anxious o show that he is the mere creature of the popular vote, so lled by the sense that it is the people and not he who governs s to fear that he should be deemed to have forgotten his ersonal insignificance. There is in the United States abun- ance of patriotism, that is to say, of a passion for the great- ess and happiness of the Republic, and a readiness to make crifices for it. The history of the Civil War showed that is passion is at least as strong as in England or France. here is no want of an appreciation of the collective majesty f the nation, for this is the theme of incessant speeches, nor ven of the past and future glories of each particular State in ie Union. But these sentiments do not bear their appro- riate fruit in raising the conception of public office, of its orth and its dignity. The newspapers assume public men o be selfish and cynical. Disinterested virtue is not looked or, is perhaps turned into ridicule where it exists. The hard ommercial spirit which pervades the meetings of a joint-stock ompany is the spirit in which most politicians speak, and e not blamed for speaking, of public business. Something, pecially in the case of newspapers, must be allowed for the umorous tendencies of the American mind, which likes to ut forward the absurd and even vulgar side of things for the ke of getting fun out of them. But after making such lowances, the fact remains that, although no people is more notional, and even in a sense more poetical, in no country is e ideal side of public life, what one may venture to call the roic element in a public career, so ignored by the mass and pudiated by the leaders. This affects not only the elevation ut the independence and courage of public men; and the untry suffers from the want of what we call distinction in conspicuous figures.

I have discussed in a previous chapter the difficulties which rround the rule of public opinion where it allows little scretion to its agents, relying upon its own competence to pervise administration and secure the legislation which a ogressive country needs. The American masses have been

obliged, both by democratic theory and by the structure of the government, to proceed upon the assumption of their ow competence. They have succeeded better than could have bee expected. No people except the choicest children of Englan long trained by the practice of local self-government at hon and in the colonies before their revolt, could have succeede half so well. Nevertheless the masses of the United States a one finds them to-day show what are the limitations of th average man. They can deal with broad and simple issue especially with issues into which a moral element enters. The spoke out with a clear strong voice upon slavery, when at la it had become plain that slavery must either spread or vanis and threw themselves with enthusiasm into the struggle f the Union. Their instinctive dislike for foreign complicatio as well as for acquisitions of new territory has repeated checked the too active diplomacy of ambitious politician Their sense of national and commercial honour has defeat more than one mischievous scheme for tampering with th public debt. But when a question of intricacy presents itse requiring either keen foresight, exact reasoning, or wide knov edge, they are at fault. Questions relating to currency a coinage, free trade and protection, improvements in the m chinery of constitutions or of municipal governments, the co trol of corporations by the law, the method of securing puri of elections, these are problems which have continued to baf them, just as the Free Soil question did before the war or t reconstruction of the revolted Southern States for a long ti after it.[1] In those two instances a solution came about, b in the former it was not so much effected by the policy of t people or their statesmen as forced on them by events, in t latter it has left serious evils behind.

Is this a defect incidental to all popular governments, or there anything in the American system specially calculated produce it?

[1] I do not deny that an American critic of the English Government mi point to one problem by which the British Parliament has been baffled two or three generations, and I will even admit that the American peo might probably have settled it sooner than the British Parliament is thou likely to do. Had Britain been either a monarchy like that of Germany a democracy like that of the United States, she would probably have b more successful in this particular matter.

A state must of course take the people as it finds them, with
ich elements of ignorance and passion as exists in masses
f men everywhere. Nevertheless, a representative or parlia-
entary system provides the means of mitigating the evils to
e feared from ignorance or haste, for it vests the actual con-
uct of affairs in a body of especially chosen and presumably
pecially qualified men, who may themselves entrust such of
heir functions as need peculiar knowledge or skill to a smaller
overning body or bodies selected in respect of their more
minent fitness. By this method the defects of democracy are
medied, while its strength is retained. The masses give
heir impulse to the representatives: the representatives, di-
cted by the people to secure certain ends, bring their skill
nd experience to bear on the choice and application of the
est means. The Americans, however, have not so constructed
composed their representative bodies as to secure a large
easure of these benefits. The legislatures are disjoined from
e administrative offices. The members of legislatures are
ot chosen for their ability or experience, but are, five-sixths
them, little above the average citizen. They are not much
spected or trusted, and finding no exceptional virtue ex-
ected from them, they behave as ordinary men do when sub-
cted to temptations. The separation of the executive from
e legislature is a part of the constitutional arrangements of
e country, and has no doubt some advantages. The charac-
r of the legislatures is due to a mistaken view of human
uality and an exaggerated devotion to popular sovereignty.
is a result of democratic theory pushed to extremes, but is
ot necessarily incident to a democratic government. The
overnment of England, for instance, has now become substan-
ally a democracy, but there is no reason why it should imi-
te America in either of the points just mentioned; nor does
mocratic France, apt enough to make a bold use of theory,
em to have pushed theory to excess in these particular direc-
ons. I do not, however, deny that a democratic system
akes the people self-confident, and that self-confidence may
sily pass into a jealousy of delegated power, an undervaluing
skill and knowledge, a belief that any citizen is good enough
r any political work. This is perhaps more likely to happen
th a people who have really reached a high level of political

competence: and so one may say that the American democra is not better just because it is so good. Were it less educate less shrewd, less actively interested in public affairs, less ind pendent in spirit, it might be more disposed, like the mass in Europe, to look up to the classes which have hitherto do the work of governing. So perhaps the excellence of ru local self-government has lowered the conception of nation government. The ordinary American farmer or shopkeep or artisan bears a part in the local government of his townsh or village, or county, or small municipality. He is quite co petent to discuss the questions that arise there. He kno his fellow-citizens, and can, if he takes the trouble, select t fittest of them for local office. No high standard of fitness needed, for the work of local administration can be adequate despatched by any sensible man of business habits. Taki his ideas from this local government, he images Congress himself as nothing more than a larger town council or boa of county commissioners, the President and his Cabinet as sort of bigger mayor and city treasurer and education super tendent; he is therefore content to choose for high Fede posts such persons as he would elect for these local offic They are such as he is himself; and it would seem to him disparagement of his own civic worth were he to deem l neighbours, honest, hard-working, keen-witted men, unfit f any places in the service of the Republic.

A European critic may remark that this way of presenti the case ignores the evils and losses which defective gove ment involves. "If," he will say, "the mass of manki possess neither the knowledge nor the leisure nor the skill determine the legislation and policy of a great state, will r the vigour of the commonwealth decline and its resources squandered? Will not a nation ruled by its average men reliance on their own average wisdom be overtaken in the ra of prosperity or overpowered in a warlike struggle by a nati of equal resources which is guided by its most capable minds The answer to this criticism is that America has hitherto be able to afford to squander her resources, and that no other st threatens her. With her wealth and in her position she c with impunity commit errors which might be fatal to t nations of Western Europe.

The comparative indifference to political life of the educated
ıd wealthy classes which is so much preached at by American
eformers and dwelt on by European critics is partly due to
ıis attitude of the multitude. These classes find no smooth
ıd easy path lying before them. Since the masses do not
ok to them for guidance, they do not come forward to give
. If they wish for office they must struggle for it, avoiding
ıe least appearance of presuming on their social position. I
ink, however, that the abstention of the upper class is largely
cribable to causes, set forth in a previous chapter, that have
ttle to do with democracy, and while believing that the
nited States have suffered from this abstention, do not regard
as an inseparable incident of their government. Accidental
uses, such as the Spoils System, which is a comparatively
cent and evidently curable distemper, have largely contrib-
ed to it.

The Spoils System reminds us of the Machine and the whole
ganization of Rings and Bosses. This ugliest feature in the
olitics of the country could not have grown up save under
ıe rule of the multitude; and some of the arrangements which
ıve aided its growth, such as the number and frequency of
ections, have been dictated by what may be called the narrow
octrinairism of democracy. It is not, however, necessarily
cident to popular government, as appears by the fact that it
ourishes in America only, where it is due to peculiar condi-
ons which might be removed without rendering the govern-
ent less truly popular. The city masses may improve if
ımigration declines; offices may cease to be the reward of
rty victory; the better citizens may throw themselves more
tively into political work.

The many forms in which wealth displays its power point
a source of evil more deep-seated than the last, and one
ıich, though common to all governments, is specially dan-
rous in a democracy. For democracy, in relying on the
erage citizen, relies on two things, the personal interest
ıich he has in good government and the public virtue which
akes him desire it for the sake of the community. Wealth,
ilfully used, can overcome the former motive, because the
are of the average man in the State is a small one, less than
e gain by which wealth may tempt him. As for virtue, the

average man's standard depends on the standard maintain by the public opinion of other average men. Now the sig of wealth frequently prevailing over the sense of duty, wi no punishment following, lowers this standard, and lea opinion to accept as inevitable what it knows to be harmf till only some specially audacious offender stirs the pub wrath. Under arbitrary governments one expects a low lev of honour in officials, because they are not responsible the people, and in the people, because they have no pow One looks for renovation to freedom, and struggles for fr dom accordingly. If similar evils appear under a governme which is already free, the remedy is less obvious and t prospect darker.

Such corruption as exists in the United States will n however, be ascribed to its democratic government by a one who remembers that corruption was rife in the Engli Parliament a century and a half ago, in English constituenc forty years ago, and now prevails not only under the despotis of Russia but also (less widely) in some other European mo archies. There are diseases which attack the body politic, li the natural body, at certain stages of growth, but disappe when a nation has passed into another stage, or when sedulo experimentation has discovered the appropriate remedy. T corruption of Parliament in Sir Robert Walpole's days ch acterized a period of transition when power had passed to t House of Commons, but the control of the people over t House had not yet been fully established, and when, throu a variety of moral causes, the tone of the nation was compa tively low. The corruption of the electorate in English b oughs appeared when a seat had become an object of des to rich men, while yet the interest of the voters in pub affairs was so feeble that they were willing to sell their vot and their number often so small that each vote fetched a hi price. The growth of intelligence and independence amo the people, as well as the introduction of severe penalties bribery, and the extinction of small constituencies, have n almost extinguished electoral corruption. Similar results m be obtained in American constituencies by better ballot a election laws, such as are now being tried in nearly all t States.

It is not, however, only in the way of bribery at popular ections that the influence of wealth is felt. It taints the ection of Federal senators by State legislatures. It induces ficials who ought to guard the purity of the ballot box to mper with returns. It procures legislation in the interests commercial undertakings. It supplies the funds for main- ining party organizations and defraying the enormous costs electoral campaigns, and demands in return sometimes a gh administrative post, sometimes a foreign mission, some- nes favours for a railroad, sometimes a clause in a tariff bill, metimes a lucrative contract. Titles and ribands it cannot, in Europe, demand, for these the country happily knows ot; yet these would be perhaps less harmful than the recom- enses it now obtains. One thing alone it can scarcely ever ay, — impunity for detected guilt. The two protections which e people retain are criminal justice, and the power, when an ection comes, of inflicting condign chastisement not only on e men over whose virtue wealth has prevailed, but even over e party in State, or nation, which they have compromised. hus the money power is held at bay, and though cities ffer terribly, and national interests seriously, the general ne of public honour does not seem to be at present declining. would, I think, improve, but for the peculiar facilities hich the last few years have revealed for the action of great rporations, wielding enormous pecuniary resources, but eeping in the background the personality of those who direct ese resources for their own behoof.

Of the faults summarized in this chapter, other than the fluence of wealth, those which might seem to go deepest, cause they have least to do with the particular constitutional rangements of the country, and are most directly the off- ring of its temper and habits, are the prominence of inferior en in politics and the absence of distinguished figures. The ople are good, but not good enough to be able to dispense th efficient service by capable representatives and officials, se guidance by strong and enlightened leaders. They are ither well served nor well led.

If it were clear that these are the fruits of liberty and uality, the prospects of the world would be darker than we ve been wont to think them. They are, however, the fruits

not of liberty and equality, but of an optimism which h
underrated the inherent difficulties of politics and inhere
failings of human nature, of a theory which has confus
equality of civil rights and duties with equality of capacit
and of a thoughtlessness which has forgotten that the pro
lems of the world and the dangers which beset society a
always putting on new faces and appearing in new direction
The Americans started their Republic with a determinati
to prevent abuses of power such as they had suffered fro
the British Crown. Freedom seemed the one thing nece
sary; and freedom was thought to consist in cutting dow
the powers of legislatures and officials. Freedom was t
national boast during the years that followed down till t
Civil War; and in the delight of proclaiming themselves sup
rior in this regard to the rest of the world they omitted
provide themselves with further requisites for good gover
ment, and forgot that power may be abused in other wa
than by monarchic tyranny or legislative usurpation. Th
continued to beat the drum along the old ramparts erected
1776 and 1789 against George III., or those who might try
imitate him, when the enemy had moved quite away fr
that side of the position, and was beginning to threaten th
rear. No maxim was more popular among them than th
which declares eternal vigilance to be the price of freedo
Unfortunately their vigilance took account only of the
dangers, and did not note the development of new ones,
if the captain of a man-of-war were to think only of his gu
and armour-plating, and neglect to protect himself against t
pedoes. Thus abuses were suffered to grow up, which seem
trivial in the midst of so general a prosperity; and good c
zens who were occupied in other and more engrossing wa
allowed politics to fall into the hands of mean men. T
efforts which these citizens are now making to recover t
control of public business would have encountered fewer
stacles had they been made sooner. But the obstacles w
be overcome. No one, I think, who has studied either t
history of the American people, or their present mind a
habits, will conclude that there is among them any jealousy
merit, any positive aversion to culture or knowledge. Neit
the political arrangements nor the social and economical c

tions of the country tend at this moment to draw its best tellects and loftiest characters into public life. But it is not he democratic temper of the people that stands in the way.

The commonest of the old charges against democracy was hat it passed into ochlocracy. I have sought to show that his has not happened, and is not likely to happen in America. he features of mob-rule do not appear in her system, whose ost characteristic faults are the existence of a professional ass using government as a means of private gain and the enacing power of wealth. Plutocracy, which the ancients ntrasted with democracy, has shown in America an inauicious affinity for certain professedly democratic institutions.

Perhaps no form of government needs great leaders so much democracy. The fatalistic habit of mind perceptible among he Americans needs to be corrected by the spectacle of courage nd independence taking their own path, and not looking to see hither the mass are moving. Those whose material prosperty tends to lap them in self-complacency and dull the edge of spiration, need to be thrilled by the emotions which great en can excite, stimulated by the ideals they present, stirred a loftier sense of what national life may attain. In some ountries men of brilliant gifts may be dangerous to freedom; ut the ambition of American statesmen has been schooled to ow in constitutional channels, and the Republic is strong nough to stand any strain to which the rise of heroes may xpose her.

CHAPTER XCIX

THE STRENGTH OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Those merits of American government which belong to t Federal Constitution have already been discussed:[1] we ha now to consider such as flow from the rule of public opinio from the temper, habits, and ideas of the people.

I. The first is that of Stability. — As one test of a hum body's soundness is its capacity for reaching a great age, so is high praise for a political system that it has stood no mo changed than any institution must change in a changing wor and that it now gives every promise of durability. The peop are profoundly attached to the form which their national life h taken. The Federal Constitution is, to their eyes, an almo sacred thing, an Ark of the Covenant, whereon no man m lay rash hands. All over Europe one hears schemes of radi change freely discussed. There is a strong monarchical par in France, a republican party in Italy and Spain, a soc democratic party everywhere, not to speak of sporadic anar ist groups. Even in England, it is impossible to feel confide that any one of the existing institutions of the country will standing fifty years hence. But in the United States the d cussion of political problems busies itself with details, so as the native Americans are concerned, and assumes that t main lines must remain as they are for ever. This conser tive spirit, jealously watchful even in small matters, sometim prevents reforms, but it assures to the people an easy mind, a a trust in their future which they feel to be not only a pres satisfaction but a reservoir of strength.

The best proof of the well-braced solidity of the system is t it survived the Civil War, changed only in a few points wh have not greatly affected the balance of National and St

[1] See Chapters XXVII.–XXX. in Vol. I.

powers. Another must have struck every European traveller who questions American publicists about the institutions of their country. When I first travelled in the United States, I used to ask thoughtful men, superior to the prejudices of custom, whether they did not think the States' system defective in such and such points, whether the legislative authority of Congress might not profitably be extended, whether the suffrage ought not to be restricted as regards negroes or immigrants, and so forth. Whether assenting or dissenting, the persons questioned invariably treated such matters as purely speculative, saying that the present arrangements were too deeply rooted for their alteration to come within the horizon of practical politics. So when a serious trouble arises, such as might in Europe threaten revolution, the people face it quietly, and assume that a tolerable solution will be found. At the disputed election of 1876, when each of the two great parties, heated with conflict, claimed that its candidate had been chosen President, and the Constitution supplied no way out of the difficulty, public tranquillity was scarcely disturbed, and the public funds fell but little. A method was invented of settling the question which both sides acquiesced in, and although the decision was a boundless disappointment to the party which had cast the majority of the popular vote, that party quietly submitted to lose those spoils of office whereon its eyes had been feasting.

II. Feeling the law to be their own work, the people are disposed to obey the law. — In a preceding chapter I have examined occasional instances of the disregard of the law, and the supersession of its tardy methods by the action of the crowd. Such instances do not deprive the Americans of the credit they claim to be a law-abiding community. It is the best result that can be ascribed to the direct participation of the people in their government that they have the love of the maker for his work, that every citizen looks upon a statute as a regulation made by himself for his own guidance no less than for that of others, every official as a person he has himself chosen, and whom it is therefore his interest, with no disparagement to his personal independence, to obey. Plato thought that those who felt their own sovereignty would be impatient of all control: nor is it to be denied that the principle of

equality may result in lowering the status and dignity of a magistrate. But as regards law and order the gain much exceeds the loss, for every one feels that there is no appeal from the law, behind which there stands the force of the nation. Such a temper can exist and bear these fruits only where minorities, however large, have learned to submit patiently to majorities, however small. But that is the one lesson which the American government through every grade and in every department daily teaches, and which it has woven into the texture of every citizen's mind. The habit of living under a rigid constitution superior to ordinary statutes — indeed two rigid constitutions, since the State Constitution is a fundamental law within its own sphere no less than is the Federal — intensifies this legality of view, since it may turn all sorts of questions which have not been determined by a direct vote of the people into questions of legal construction. It even accustoms people to submit to see their direct vote given in the enactment of a State Constitution nullified by the decision of a court holding that the Federal Constitution has been contravened. Every page of American history illustrates the whole some results. The events of the last few years present an instance of the constraint which the people put on themselves in order to respect every form of law. The Mormons, a community not exceeding 140,000 persons, persistently defied all the efforts of Congress to root out polygamy, a practice eminently repulsive to American notions. If they inhabited a State, Congress could not have interfered at all, but as Utah is only a Territory, Congress has not only a power of legislating for it which overrides Territorial ordinances passed by the local legislature, but the right to apply military force independent of local authorities. Thus the Mormons were really at the mercy of the Federal government, had it chosen to employ violent methods. But by entrenching themselves behind the letter of the Constitution, they continued for many years to maintain their "peculiar institution" by evading the statutes passed against it and challenging a proof which under the common law rules of evidence it was usually found impossible to give. Declaimers hounded on Congress to take arbitrary means for the suppression of the practice, but Congress and the executive submitted to be outwitted rather than depar

from the accustomed principles of legislation, and succeeded at last only by a statute whose searching but strictly constitutional provisions the recalcitrants failed to evade. The same spirit of legality shows itself in misgoverned cities. Even where it is notorious that officials have been chosen by the grossest fraud and that they are robbing the city, the body of the people, however indignant, recognize the authority, and go on paying the taxes which a Ring levies, because strict legal proof of the frauds and robberies is not forthcoming. Wrongdoing supplies a field for the display of virtue.

III. There is a broad simplicity about the political ideas of the people, and a courageous consistency in carrying them out in practice. When they have accepted a principle, they do not shrink from applying it "right along," however disagreeable in particular cases some of the results may be. I am far from meaning that they are logical in the French sense of the word. They have little taste either for assuming abstract propositions or for syllogistically deducing practical conclusions therefrom. But when they have adopted a general maxim of policy or rule of action they show more faith in it than the English for instance would do, they adhere to it where the English would make exceptions, they prefer certainty and uniformity to the advantages which might occasionally be gained by deviation.[1] If this tendency is partly the result of obedience to a rigid constitution, it is no less due to the democratic dislike of exceptions and complexities, which the multitude finds not only difficult of comprehension but disquieting to the individual who may not know how they will affect him. Take for instance the boundless freedom of the press. There are abuses obviously incident to such freedom, and these abuses have not failed to appear. But the Americans deliberately hold that in view of the benefits which such freedom on the whole promises, abuses must be borne with and left to the sentiment of the people

[1] What has been said (Chapters XLIV. and XLV.) of special and local legislation by the State legislatures may seem an exception to this rule. Such legislation, however, is usally procured in the dark and by questionable means.

Looking both to the National and to the State governments, it may be said that, with a few exceptions, no people has shown a greater regard for public obligations, and that no people has more prudently and honourably refrained from legislation bearing hardly upon the rich, or indeed upon any class whatever.

and the private law of libel to deal with. When the Ku Klu outrages disgraced several of the Southern States after th military occupation of those States had ceased, there wa much to be said for sending back the troops to protect th negroes and Northern immigrants. But the general judgmer that things ought to be allowed to take their natural cours prevailed; and the result justified this policy, for the ou rages after a while died out, when ordinary self-governmer had been restored. When recently a gigantic organization unions of working men, purporting to unite the whole American labour, attempted to enforce its sentences again particular firms or corporations by a boycott in which a labourers were urged to join, there was displeasure, but n panic, no call for violent remedies. The prevailing faith liberty and in the good sense of the mass was unshaken; an the result soon justified this tranquil faith. Such a tendenc is not an unmixed blessing, for it sometimes allows evils to too long unchecked. But in giving equability to the syste of government it gives steadiness and strength. It teach the people patience, accustoming them to expect relief only b constitutional means. It confirms their faith in their instit tions, as friends value one another more when their friendsh has stood the test of a journey full of hardships.

IV. American government, relying very little on official has the merit of arming them with little power of arbitra interference. The reader who has followed the descriptio of Federal authorities, State authorities, county and ci or township authorities, may think there is a great deal administration; but the description has been minute ju because the powers of each authority are so carefully an closely restricted. It is natural to fancy that a governme of the people and by the people will be led to undertake mar and various functions for the people, and in the confidence its strength will constitute itself a general philanthrop agency for their social and economic benefit. There has doub less been of late years a current running in this direction But the paternalism of America differs from that of Euro in acting not so much through officials as through th law. That is to say, when it prescribes to the citizen

[1] See Chapter XCV.

articular course of action it relies upon the ordinary legal anctions, instead of investing the administrative officers ith inquisitorial duties or powers that might prove oppres-ve, and when it devolves active functions upon officials, they re functions serving to aid the individual and the community ather than to interfere with or supersede the action of pri-ate enterprise. Having dwelt on the evils which may flow rom the undue application of the doctrine of direct popular overeignty, I must remind the European reader that it is nly fair to place to the credit of that doctrine and of the rrangements it has dictated, the intelligence which the aver-ge native American shows in his political judgments, the rong sense he entertains of the duty of giving a vote, the pirit of alertness and enterprise, which has made him self-elpful above all other men.

V. There are no struggles between privileged and unprivi-ged orders, not even that perpetual strife of rich and poor hich is the oldest disease of civilized states. One must not ronounce broadly that there are no classes, for in parts of ie country social distinctions have begun to grow up. But r political purposes classes scarcely exist. No one of the uestions which now agitate the nation is a question between ch and poor. Instead of suspicion, jealousy, and arrogance nbittering the relations of classes, good feeling and kindli-ss reign. Everything that government, as the Americans ve hitherto understood the term, can give them, the poorer ass have already, political power, equal civil rights, a career pen to all citizens alike, not to speak of that gratuitous gher as well as elementary education which on their own onomic principles the United States might have abstained om giving, but which political reasons have led them to ovide with so unstinting a hand. Hence the poorer have d nothing to fight for, no grounds for disliking the well-do, no complaints to make against them. The agitation of e last few years has been directed, not against the richer rt generally, but against incorporated companies and a few ealthy capitalists, who are deemed to have abused the powers hich the privilege of incorporation conferred upon them, or nployed their wealth to procure legislation unfair to the blic. Where violent language has been used like that with

which France and Germany are familiar, it has been used, n by native Americans, but by new-comers, who bring their O World passions with them. Property is safe, because tho who hold it are far more numerous than those who do no the usual motives for revolution vanish; universal suffrag even when vested in ignorant new-comers, can do compar tively little harm, because the masses have obtained ever thing which they could hope to attain except by a gener pillage. And the native Americans, though the same cann be said of some of the recent immigrants, are shrewd enoug to see that the poor would suffer from such pillage no le than the rich.

[Revising this chapter in 1894, I leave these words, whi were written in 1888, to stand as they were. They th expressed, as I believe, the view which the most judicio Americans themselves took of their country. Looking at t labour troubles of the last three years, and especially at t great railroad strike riots of July, 1894, that view may see too roseate. It is, however, to be remembered that those ri were mainly the work of recent immigrants, whom Americ institutions have not had time to educate, though the folly abstract theory has confided votes to them; and it must al be noted that the opinion of the native Americans, with lit distinction of class, approved the boldness with which t Federal executive went to the extreme limit of its consti tional powers in repressing them. In any case it seems bet to await the teachings of the next few years rather than matured conclusions be suddenly modified by passing events.

A European censor may make two reflections on the sta ment of this part of the case. He will observe that, after a it is no more than saying that when you have got to the b tom you can fall no farther. And he will ask whether, property is safe and contentment reigns, these advantages a not due to the economical conditions of a new and resource country, with an abundance of unoccupied land and mine wealth, rather than to the democratic structure of the gove ment. The answer to the first objection is, that the desce towards equality and democracy has involved no injury to t richer or better educated classes: to the second, that althou much must doubtless be ascribed to the bounty of nature, h

vours have been so used by the people as to bring about a osperity, a general diffusion of property, an abundance of eedom, of equality, and of good feeling which furnish the st security against the recurrence in America of chronic Old orld evils, even when her economic state shall have become ss auspicious than it now is. Wealthy and powerful such a untry must have been under any form of government, but e speed with which she has advanced, and the employment the sources of wealth to diffuse comfort among millions of nilies, may be placed to the credit of stimulative freedom. holesome habits have been established among the people ıose value will be found when the times of pressure ap- oach, and though the troubles that have arisen between our and capital may not soon pass away, the sense of man equality, the absence of offensive privileges distin- ishing class from class, will make those troubles less severe an in Europe, where they are complicated by the recollec- n of old wrongs, by arrogance on the one side and envy on e other.

Some American panegyrists of democracy have weakened eir own case by claiming for a form of government all the umphs which modern science has wrought in a land of un- ualled natural resources. An active European race would obably have made America rich and prosperous under any vernment. But the volume and the character of the pros- ity attained may be in large measure ascribed to the insti- ions of the country. As Mr. Charles W. Eliot observes in ingularly thoughtful address: —

'Sensible and righteous government ought ultimately to make a nation ; and although this proposition cannot be directly reversed, yet dif- ed well-being, comfort, and material prosperity establish a fair pre- ption in favour of the government and the prevailing social conditions er which these blessings have been secured. . . .

'The successful establishment and support of religious institutions — rches, seminaries, and religious charities — upon a purely voluntary em, is an unprecedented achievement of the American democracy. In three generations American democratic society has effected the com- e separation of Church and State, a reform which no other people has attempted. Yet religious institutions are not stinted in the United es; on the contrary, they abound and thrive, and all alike are pro- ed and encouraged, but not supported, by the State. . . . The main-

tenance of churches, seminaries, and charities by voluntary contributi and by the administrative labours of volunteers, implies an enormous incessant expenditure of mental and moral force. It is a force wh must ever be renewed from generation to generation; for it is a perso force, constantly expiring, and as constantly to be replaced. Into maintenance of the voluntary system in religion has gone a good par the moral energy which three generations have been able to spare f the work of getting a living; but it is worth the sacrifice, and will accounted in history one of the most remarkable feats of American pu spirit and faith in freedom.

"A similar exhibition of diffused mental and moral energy has acc panied the establishment and the development of a system of hig instruction in the United States, with no inheritance of monastic end ments, and no gifts from royal or ecclesiastical personages disposin great resources derived from the State, and with but scanty help f the public purse. Whoever is familiar with the colleges and univers of the United States knows that the creation of these democratic ins tions has cost the life-work of thousands of devoted men. At the sacr of other aspirations, and under heavy discouragements and disappo ments, but with faith and hope, these teachers and trustees have buil institutions, which, however imperfect, have cherished scientific enth asm, fostered piety, literature, and art, maintained the standard honour and public duty, and steadily kept in view the ethical id which democracy cherishes. It has been a popular work, to which l numbers of people in successive generations have contributed of their stance or of their labour. The endowment of institutions of educat including libraries and museums, by private persons in the United St is a phenomenon without precedent or parallel, and is a legitimate e of democratic institutions. Under a tyranny — were it that of a Ma Aurelius — or an oligarchy — were it as enlightened as that which rules Germany — such a phenomenon would be simply impossible. the voluntary system in religion, the voluntary system in the higher cation buttresses democracy; each demands from the community a l outlay of intellectual activity and moral vigour."

VI. The government of the Republic, limited and lang in ordinary times, is capable of developing immense vig It can pull itself together at moments of danger, can put fo unexpected efforts, can venture on stretches of authority tr cending not only ordinary practice but even ordinary This is the result of the unity of the nation. A divided pe is a weak people, even if it obeys a monarch; a united pe is doubly strong when it is democratic, for then the forc each individual will swells the collective force of the gov ment, encourages it, relieves it from internal embarrassme

v the American people is united at moments of national con-
n from two causes. One is that absence of class divisions
jealousies which has been already described. The people
homogeneous: a feeling which stirs them stirs alike rich
poor, farmers and traders, Eastern men and Western men
ne may now add, Southern men also. Their patriotism has
sed to be defiant, and is conceived as the duty of promoting
greatness and happiness of their country, a greatness which,
t does not look to war or aggression, does not redound spe-
ly, as it might in Europe, to the glory or benefit of the ruling
e or the military profession, but to that of all the citizens.
other source of unity is the tendency in democracies for
sentiment of the majority to tell upon the sentiment of
inority. That faith in the popular voice whereof I have
ady spoken strengthens every feeling which has once be-
e strong, and makes it rush like a wave over the country,
eping everything before it. I do not mean that the people
me wild with excitement, for beneath their noisy demon-
tions they retain their composure and shrewd view of facts.
ean only that the pervading sympathy stirs them to un-
ted efforts. The steam is superheated, but the effect is
only in the greater expansive force which it exerts.
ce a spirited executive can in critical times go forward
a courage and confidence possible only to those who know
they have a whole nation behind them. The people fall
rank at once. With that surprising gift for organization
ch they possess, they concentrate themselves on the imme-
e object; they dispense with the ordinary constitutional
rictions; they make personal sacrifices which remind one
he self-devotion of Roman citizens in the earlier days of
ie.

peaking thus, I am thinking chiefly of the spirit evolved by
Civil War in both the North and the South. But the sort
trength which a democratic government derives from its
t dependence on the people is seen in many smaller in-
ces. In 1863, when on the making of a draft of men for
war, the Irish mob rose in New York City, excited by the
nce of General Robert E. Lee into Pennsylvania, the State
rnor called out the troops, and by them restored order with
rn vigour which would have done credit to Radetzsky or

Cavaignac. More than a thousand rioters were shot down, public opinion entirely approved the slaughter. Years a the war, when the Orangemen of New York purposed to ha 12th of July procession through the streets, the Irish Cath threatened to prevent it. The feeling of the native Ameri was aroused at once; young men of wealth came back i their mountain and seaside resorts to fill the militia regim which were called out to guard the procession, and the dis of force was so overwhelming that no disturbance follo These Americans had no sympathy with the childish and chievous partisanship which leads the Orangemen to perpet Old World feuds on New World soil. But processions legal, and they were resolved that the law should be respe and the spirit of disorder repressed. They would have equally ready to protect a Roman Catholic procession.

Given an adequate occasion, executive authority in Am can better venture to take strong measures, and feels more of support from the body of the people than is the cas England. When there is a failure to enforce the law, the lies at the door, not of the people, but of timid or time-ser officials who fear to offend some interested section of the vo

VII. Democracy has not only taught the Americans ho use liberty without abusing it, and how to secure equality has also taught them fraternity. That word has gone ou fashion in the Old World, and no wonder, considering was done in its name in 1793, considering also that it stil ures in the programme of assassins. Nevertheless there the United States a sort of kindliness, a sense of human fe ship, a recognition of the duty of mutual help owed by ma man, stronger than anywhere in the Old World, and certa stronger than in the upper or middle classes of England, Fr or Germany. The natural impulse of every citizen in Am is to respect every other citizen, and to feel that citizen constitutes a certain ground of respect. The idea of each m equal rights is so fully realized that the rich or powerful feels it no indignity to take his turn among the crowd, and not expect any deference from the poorest. An indiv employer of labour (for one cannot say the same of cor tions) has, I think, a keener sense of his duty to those w he employs than employers have in continental Europe.

certainly a greater sense of responsibility for the use of his lth. The number of gifts for benevolent and other public poses, the number of educational, artistic, literary, and ntific foundations, is larger than even in Britain, the lthiest and most liberal of European countries. Wealth enerally felt to be a trust, and exclusiveness condemned merely as indicative of selfishness, but as a sort of offence inst the public. No one, for instance, thinks of shutting his pleasure-grounds; he seldom even builds a wall round n, but puts up low railings or a palisade, so that the sight his trees and shrubs is enjoyed by passers-by. That any should be permitted either by opinion or by law to seal up y square miles of beautiful mountain country against tour- or artists is to the ordinary American almost incredible. h things are to him the marks of a land still groaning er feudal tyranny.

may seem strange to those who know how difficult Euro- n states have generally found it to conduct negotiations h the government of the United States, and who are accus- ed to read in European newspapers the defiant utterances ch American politicians address from Congress to the effete archies of the Old World, to be told that this spirit of ernity has its influence on international relations also. ertheless if we look not at the irresponsible orators, who to the lower feelings of a section of the people, but at general sentiment of the whole people, we shall recognize democracy makes both for peace and for justice as reen nations. Despite the admiration for military exploits ch the Americans have sometimes shown, no country is at om more pervaded by a hatred of war, and a sense that onal honour stands rooted in national fair dealing. The on is often misrepresented by its statesmen, but although lows them to say irritating things and advance unreason- claims, it has not for more than forty years permitted n to abuse its enormous strength, as most European nations essed of similar strength have in time past abused theirs. ne characteristics of the nation which I have passed in ew are not due solely to democratic government, but they been strengthened by it, and they contribute to its ity and to the smoothness of its working. As one some-

times sees an individual man who fails in life because different parts of his nature seem unfitted to each othe that his action, swayed by contending influences, resul nothing definite or effective, so one sees nations whose pol institutions are either in advance of or lag behind their s conditions, so that the unity of the body politic suffers the harmony of its movements is disturbed. America is such a nation. There have, no doubt, been two diverse ences at work on the minds of men. One is the conserv English spirit, brought from home, expressed, and (if one say so) entrenched in those fastnesses of the Federal Co tution, and (to a less degree) of the State constitutions w reveal their English origin. The other is the devotio democratic equality and popular sovereignty, due part Puritanism, partly to abstract theory, partly to the cir stances of the Revolutionary struggle. But since neith these two streams of tendency has been able to overcome other, they have at last become so blent as to form a de type of political habits, and a self-consistent body of pol ideas. Thus it may now be said that the country is mad of a piece. Its institutions have become adapted to its nomic and social conditions and are the due expression o character. The new wine has been poured into new bot or to adopt a metaphor more appropriate to the country vehicle has been built with a lightness, strength, and elas which fit it for the roads it has to traverse.

CHAPTER C

W FAR AMERICAN EXPERIENCE IS AVAILABLE FOR EUROPE

There are two substantial services which the study of history ay render to politics. The one is to correct the use, which is nerally the abuse, of the deductive or *a priori* method of asoning in politics. The other is to save the politician from ing misled by superficial historical analogies. He who re-diates the *a priori* method is apt to fancy himself a practical n, when, running to the other extreme, he argues directly m the phenomena of one age or country to those of another, l finding somewhat similar causes or conditions bids us to pect similar results. His error is as grave as that of the n who relies on abstract reasonings; for he neglects that tical examination of the premises from which every process reasoning ought to start. The better trained any historical uirer is, so much the more cautious will he be in the employ-nt of what are called historical arguments in politics. He ows how necessary it is in attempting to draw any conclusion practical worth for one country from the political experience another, to allow for the points in which the countries differ, ause among these points there are usually some which affect soundness of the inference, making it doubtful whether that ich holds true of the one will hold true of the other. The ue of history for students of politics or practical statesmen rather in its power of quickening their insight, in its giving m a larger knowledge of the phenomena of man's nature as olitical being and of the tendencies that move groups and mmunities of men, and thus teaching them how to observe facts that come under their own eyes, and what to expect m the men with whom they have to deal. A thinker duly rcised in historical research will carry his stores of the ld's political experience about with him, not as a book of pre-

scriptions or recipes from which he can select one to apply a given case, but rather as a physician carries a treatise pathology which instructs him in the general principles to followed in observing the symptoms and investigating causes of the maladies that come before him. So, although character of democratic government in the United States is of instruction for Europeans, it supplies few conclusions direc bearing on the present politics of any European country, beca both the strong and the weak points of the American people not exactly repeated anywhere in the Old World, not even such countries as France, Switzerland, and England. The p ure given of the phenomena of America in preceding chap has probably already suggested to the reader the inferences t drawn from it, and such application as they may have to Eur I shall therefore be here content with recapitulating in the m concise way the points in which the institutions of the Uni States and the methods employed in working them seem not quite directly, yet most nearly, to touch and throw li upon European problems. America has in some respects an pated European nations. She is walking before them alon path which they may probably follow. She carries behind to adopt a famous simile of Dante's, a lamp whose light h those who come after her more than it always does hers because some of the dangers she has passed through may recur at any other point in her path; whereas they, follow in her footsteps, may stumble in the same stony places, or entangled in the quagmires into which she slipped.

I. *Manhood Suffrage.*— This has been now adopted by many peoples of Europe that they have the less occasion study its transatlantic aspects. The wisest Americans, w appreciating the strength which it gives to their governm and conceiving that they could hardly have stopped short o hold that their recent experience does not invite imitation European nations, unless at least Europeans adopt safegu resembling those they have applied. With those safegua the abolition of property qualifications has, so far as native population is concerned, proved successful; but in hands of the negroes at the South, or the newly enfranch immigrants of the larger cities, a vote is a weapon of chief.

II. *The Civil Service.* — To keep minor administrative offices ut of politics, to make them tenable for life and obtainable by ierit instead of by private patronage, is at present the chief im of American reformers. They are laboriously striving to ring their civil service up to the German or British level. If iere is any lesson they would seek to impress on Europeans, is the danger of allowing politics to get into the hands of ien who seek to make a living by them, and of suffering ublic offices to become the reward of party work. Rather, iey would say, interdict office-holders from participation in olitics; appoint them by competition, however absurd competition may sometimes appear, choose them by lot, like the thenians and Florentines; only do not let offices be tenable t the pleasure of party chiefs and lie in the uncontrolled atronage of persons who can use them to strengthen their wn political position.[1]

III. *The Judiciary.* — The same observation applies to judial posts, and with no less force. The American State Bench uffers both from the too prevalent system of popular election nd from the scanty remuneration allotted. To procure men f character, learning, and intellectual power, and to keep them ndependent, ample remuneration must be paid, a life tenure ecured, and the appointments placed in responsible hands. here is nothing in the English frame of government which houghtful Americans so much admire as the maintenance of high level of integrity and capacity in the judges; and they ften express a hope that nothing will be done to lower the osition of officials on whose excellence the well-being and ommercial credit of a country largely depend.[2]

IV. *Character and Working of Legislatures.*[3] — Although the ule of representative chambers has been deemed the most haracteristic feature of well-ordered free governments, as conrasted with those impetuous democracies of antiquity which gislated by primary assemblies, it must be confessed that the gislative bodies of the United States have done something to iscredit representative government. Whether this result is ainly due, as some think, to the disconnection of the Executive from the legislature, or whether it must be traced to

[1] See Chapter LXV. [2] See Chapters XLII and CII. [3] See Chapters IV, XIX, XLI, XLIV, XLV.

deeper sources of weakness, it is not without instruction f those who would in Europe vest in legislatures, and, perhap even in one-chambered legislatures, still wider powers of inte ference with administration than they now possess.

V. *Second Chambers.*[1] — The Americans consider the di sion of every political legislature into two co-ordinate bodi to be absolutely necessary; and their opinion, in this respe is the more valuable because several States tried for a time work with one chamber, and because they are fully sensib of the inconveniences which the frequent collision of t chambers involves. Their view is, doubtless, tinged by t low opinion which they hold of the quality of their legislato Distrusting these, they desire to place every possible che upon their action. In cities it does not appear that either t two-chambered or the one-chambered system shows any adva tage over the other; but it is now beginning to be seen tha city council ought not to be conceived of as a legislature, a that city government has altogether been planned and conduct too much on political, and too little on commercial, lines.

VI. *Length of Legislative Terms.*[2] — The gain and the loss having legislatures elected for short terms are sufficiently ob ous. To a European, the experience of Congress seems to in cate that the shortness of its term is rather to be avoided th imitated. It is not needed in order to secure the obedience Congress to the popular will: it increases the cost of polit by making elections more frequent, and it keeps a considera proportion of the legislators employed in learning a busin from which they are dismissed as soon as they have learnt

VII. *Indirect Elections.*[3] — American experience does not co mend this device, which, until the establishment of the pres mode of choosing the French Senate, was chiefly known from employment in the Republic of Venice. The choice of President by electors, chosen for the purpose, has wholly fai to attain the object its authors desired. The election of se tors by State legislatures gives no better, and possibly wo men to the Senate, than direct popular election would give.

VIII. *A Rigid Constitution.*[4] — Although several Europ states have now placed themselves under constitutions

[1] See Chapters XVIII, XL, and L. [2] See Chapters XIX and XL. [3] Chapters V, X, and VII. [4] See Chapters XXIII, XXXI–XXXV, and XXX

alterable by their legislatures in the same way as ordinary statutes are altered, America furnishes in her State governments, as well as in her Federal government, by far the most instructive examples of the working of a system under which certain laws are made fundamental, and surrounded not only with a sort of consecration, but with provisions which make change comparatively difficult. There is nothing in their system with whose results, despite some obvious drawbacks, the multitude, scarcely less than the wise, are so well satisfied; nothing which they more frequently recommend to the consideration of those Europeans who are alarmed at the progress which democracy makes in the Old World.

IX. *Direct Legislation by the People.*[1] — In this respect also the example of the several States — for the Federal government is not in point — deserves to be well studied by English and French statesmen. I greatly doubt if the plan, whose merits seem to me in America to outweigh its defects, would work as well in a large country as it does in communities of the size of the American States. Even in them it is useful less by its own merits than by comparison with the vices of the legislatures. The people are as likely to be right in judgment as are those bodies; and they are more honest and more independent. The institution is a highly democratic one; and in countries which have capable and trustworthy legislatures might work ill by lowering their dignity and importance. It would be an appeal from comparative knowledge to comparative ignorance. This consideration does not apply to its use in local affairs, where it stimulates the activity of the citizen without superseding the administrative body.

X. *Local Self-government.*[2] — Nothing has more contributed to give strength and flexibility to the government of the United States, or to train the masses of the people to work their democratic institutions, than the existence everywhere in the Northern States of self-governing administrative units, such as townships, small enough to enlist the personal interest and be subject to the personal watchfulness and control of the ordinary citizen. Abuses have indeed sprung up in the cities, and in the case of the largest among them have become for-

[1] See Chapter XXXIX. [2] See Chapters XLVIII-LII.

midable, partly because the principle of local control has no
been sufficiently adhered to. Nevertheless the system of loc
government as a whole has been not merely beneficial, bu
indispensable, and well deserves the study of those who i
Europe are alive to the evils of centralization, and perceiv
that those evils will not necessarily diminish with a furth
democratization of such countries as Britain, Germany, an
Italy. I do not say that in any of the great European state
the mass of the rural population is equally competent wit
the American to work such a system: still it presents a mod
towards which European institutions ought to tend. Ver
different is the lesson which the American cities teach. It
a lesson of what to avoid. Nowhere have the conjoint infl
ences of false theory, party cohesion and the apathy of goo
citizens, together with a recklessly granted suffrage renderc
municipal government so wasteful, inefficient, and impure.

XI. *The Absence of a Church Establishment.* — As the di
cussion of ecclesiastical matters belongs to a later part of th
book,[1] I must be content with observing that in Ameri
everybody, to whatever religious communion he belongs, pr
fesses satisfaction with the complete separation of Church an
State. This separation has not tended to make religion le
of a force in America as respects either political or soci
reform, nor does it prevent the people from considering Chri
tianity to be the national religion, and their commonweal
an object of the Divine care.

XII. *Party Machinery.*[2] — The tremendous power of par
organization has been described. It enslaves local officials,
increases the tendency to regard members of Congress as me
delegates, it keeps men of independent character out of loc
and national politics, it puts bad men into place, it perver
the wishes of the people, it has in some places set up a tyran
under the forms of democracy. Yet it is hard to see how fr
government can go on without parties, and certain that t
strenuous rivalry of parties will not dispense with machiner
The moral for Europe seems to be the old one that "Perpetu
vigilance is the price of freedom," that the best citizens mu
as the Americans say, "take hold," must by themselves acce
ing posts in the organization keep it from falling into the han

[1] See Chapters CVI and CVII. [2] See Chapters LIX–LXV.

of professionals, must entrust as few lucrative places as possible to popular election or political patronage, must leave reasonable discretion to their representatives in the national councils, must endeavour to maintain in politics the same standard of honour which guides them in private life. These are moral rather than political precepts, but party organization is one of those things which is good or bad according to the spirit with which it is worked.

XIII. *The Unattractiveness of Politics.*[1] — Partly from the influence of party machinery, partly from peculiarities of the Federal Constitution, partly from social and economical causes, the American system does not succeed in bringing the best men to the top. Yet in democracy more perhaps than in other governments, seeing it is the most delicate and difficult of governments, it is essential that the best men should come to the top. There is in this fact matter for Europeans to reflect upon, for they have assumed that political success will always attract ambition, and that public life will draw at least enough of the highest ability into its whirlpool. America disproves the assumption. Her example does not, however, throw much light on the way to keep politics attractive, for her conditions are dissimilar to those of European countries, where ambition finds less scope for distinction in the field of industrial enterprise, and rank is less disjoined from political eminence.

XIV. *The Power of Wealth.* — Plutocracy used to be considered a form of oligarchy, and opposed to democracy. But here is a strong plutocratic element infused into American democracy; and the fact that constitutions ignore differences of property, treating all voters alike, makes it neither less potent nor less mischievous. Of the power of wealth democracies may say, with Dante, Here we find the great enemy.[2] It has doubtless afflicted all forms of government. But it seems specially pernicious in a free government, because when the disease appeared under despotisms and oligarchies, freedom was deemed the only and sufficient antidote. Experience, however, shows that in democracies it is no less menacing, for the personal interest of the average man in good government — and in a large democracy he feels himself insignificant — is

[1] See Chapters LVIII and LXXIV.

[2] Quivi trovammo Pluto il gran nemico: *Inf.* VI, 115.

overborne by the inducements which wealth, skilfully em ployed, can offer him; and when once the average man' standard of public virtue has been lowered by the sight o numerous deflections from virtue in others, great is the diffi culty of raising it. In the United States the money powe acts by corrupting sometimes the voter, sometimes the juror sometimes the legislator, sometimes a whole party: for large sub scriptions and promises of political support have been known to influence a party to procure or refrain from such legislatio as wealth desires or fears. The rich, it is but fair to say, and especially great corporations, have not only enterprises t promote but dangers to escape from at the hands of unscrupu lous demagogues or legislators. But whether their actio has this palliation or not, the belief, often well grounded that they exercise a secret power in their own interests exasperates other sections of the community, and has been factor in producing not only unwise legislation directed agains them, but also outbreaks of lawless violence.

To these scattered observations, which I have made abrup in order to avoid being led into repetitions, I need hardly ad the general moral which the United States teach, that th masses of the people are wiser, fairer, and more temperate i any matter to which they can be induced to bend their mind than most European philosophers have believed it possible fo the masses of the people to be; because this is the moral whic the preceding chapters on Public Opinion have been intende to make clear. But the reader is again to be reminded th while the foregoing points are those in which American exp rience seems most directly available for European states, h must not expect the problems America has solved, or thos which still perplex her, to reappear in Europe in the sam forms. Such facts — to mention two only out of many — a the abundance of land and the absence of menace from oth Powers show how dissimilar are the conditions under whic popular government works in the Eastern and in the Weste hemisphere. Nothing can be more instructive than America experience if it be discreetly used, nothing will be more mi leading to one who tries to apply it without allowing for th differences of economic and social environment.

PART VI

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CHAPTER CI

THE BAR

Among the organized institutions of a country which, while
t directly a part of the government, influence politics as well
society, the Bar has in England, Scotland, and France
ayed a part only second to that played by the Church. Cer-
inly no English institution is more curiously and distinc-
vely English than this body, with its venerable traditions, its
istocratic sympathies, its strong, though now declining, cor-
rate spirit, its affinity for certain forms of literature, its
igular relation, half of dependence, half of condescension, to
e solicitors, its friendly control over its official superiors,
e judges. To see how such an institution has shaped itself
d thriven in a new country is to secure an excellent means
estimating the ideas, conditions, and habits which affect
d colour the social system of that country, as well as to
amine one of the chief among the secondary forces of public
e. It is therefore not merely for the sake of satisfying the
riosity of English lawyers that I propose to sketch some of
e salient features of the legal profession as it exists in the
ited States, and to show how it has developed apart from
e restrictions imposed on it in England by ancient custom,
d under the unchecked operation of the laws of demand and
pply.

When England sent out her colonies, the Bar, like most of
r other institutions, reappeared upon the new soil, and had
ined before the revolution of 1776 a position similar to that
held at home, not owing to any deliberate purpose on the
rt of those who led and ruled the new communities (for the
ritan settlers at least held lawyers in slight esteem), but
cause the conditions of a progressive society required its
istence. That disposition to simplify and popularize law, to

make it less of a mystery and bring it more within the rea
of an average citizen, which is strong in modern Europe,
of course still stronger in a colony, and naturally tended
America to lessen the corporate exclusiveness of the leg
profession, and do away with the antiquated rules which ha
governed it in England. On the other hand, the increasi
complexity of relations in modern society, and the developme
of many new arts and departments of applied science, bri
into an always clearer light the importance of a division
labour, and, by attaching greater value to special knowled
and skill, tend to limit and define the activity of every profe
sion. In spite, therefore, of the democratic aversion to exc
sive organizations, the lawyers in America soon acquired pr
fessional habits and a corporate spirit similar to that of the
brethren in England; and some fifty years ago they h
reached a power and social consideration relatively great
than the Bar has ever held on the eastern side of the Atlant

But the most characteristic peculiarity of the English syste
disappeared. In the United States, as in some parts of Euro
and most British colonies, there is no distinction betwe
barristers and attorneys. Every lawyer, or "counsel," is p
mitted to take every kind of business: he may argue a cau
in the Supreme Federal court at Washington, or write six-a
eightpenny letters from a shopkeeper to an obstinate debt
He may himself conduct all the proceedings in a cause, con
with the client, issue the writ, draw the declaration, get togeth
the evidence, prepare the brief, and conduct the case when
comes on in court. He is employed, not like the English b
rister, by another professional man, but by the client himse
who seeks him out and makes his bargain directly with hi
just as in England people call in a physician or make th
bargain with an architect. In spite, however, of this union
all a lawyer's functions in the same person, considerations
practical convenience have in many places established a di
sion of labour similar to that existing in England. Where t
or more lawyers are in partnership, it often happens that
member undertakes the court work and the duties of the ad
cate, while another or others transact the rest of the busine
see the clients, conduct correspondence, hunt up evide
prepare witnesses for examination, and manage the thousa

le things for which a man goes to his attorney. The merits the plan are obvious. It saves the senior member from idgery, and from being distracted by petty details; it intro-es the juniors to business, and enables them to profit by experience and knowledge of the mature practitioner; it ures to the client the benefit of a closer attention to details n a leading counsel could be expected to give, while yet whole of his suit is managed in the same office, and the ponsibility is not divided, as in England, between two inde-ident personages. However, the custom of forming legal tnerships is one which prevails much more extensively in ne parts of the Union than in others. In Boston and New rk, for instance, it is common, and I think in the Western es; in the towns of Connecticut and in Philadelphia one told that it is rather the exception. Even apart from arrangement which distributes the various kinds of busi-s among the members of a firm, there is a certain tendency work of a different character to fall into the hands of dif-ent men. A beginner is of course glad enough to be em-yed in any way, and takes willingly the smaller jobs; he l conduct a defence in a police-court, or manage the recovery a tradesman's petty debt. I remember having been told by ery eminent counsel that when an old apple-woman applied his son to have her market licence renewed, which for some son had been withdrawn, he had insisted on the young n's taking up the case. As he rises, it becomes easier for n to select his business, and when he has attained real nence he may confine himself entirely to the higher walks, uing cases and giving opinions, but leaving most of the paratory work and all the communications with the client be done by the juniors who are retained along with him. is, in fact, with the important difference that he is liable any negligence, very much in the position of an English een's counsel, and his services are sought, not only by the nt, but by another counsel, or firm of counsel, who have an portant suit in hand, to which they feel themselves unequal. may however be, and often is, retained directly by the nt; and in that case he is allowed to retain a junior to aid , or to desire the client to do so, naming the man he wishes a thing which the etiquette of the English bar is supposed

to forbid. In every great city there are several practition of this kind, men who only undertake the weightiest busin at the largest fees; and even in the minor towns court p tice is in the hands of a comparatively small group. In New England city, for instance, whose population is ab 50,000, there are, I was told, some sixty or seventy practis lawyers, of whom not more than ten or twelve ever conduc case in court, the remainder doing what Englishmen wo call attorney's and conveyancer's work.

Whatever disadvantages this system of one undivided le profession has, it has one conspicuous merit, on which any who is accustomed to watch the career of the swarm of yo men who annually press into the Temple or Lincoln's Inn of bright hopes, may be pardoned for dwelling. It afford far better prospect of speedy employment and an active fessional life, than the beginner who is not "strongly back can look forward to in England. Private friends can do m more to help a young man, since he gets business direct f the client instead of from a solicitor; he may pick up li bits of work which his prosperous seniors do not care to h may thereby learn those details of practice of which in land a barrister often remains ignorant, may gain experi and confidence in his own powers, may teach himself ho speak and how to deal with men, may gradually form a nection among those for whom he has managed trifling ters, may commend himself to the good opinion of o lawyers, who will be glad to retain him as their junior w they have a brief to give away. So far he is better off the young barrister in England. He is also, in another more favourably placed than the young English solicitor. is not taught to rely in cases of legal difficulty upon opinion of another person. He is not compelled to seek acquaintances among the less cultivated members of the fession, to the majority of whom law is not much of a and nothing of a science. He does not see the path o honourable ambition, the opportunities of forensic ora the access to the judicial bench, irrevocably closed ag him, but has the fullest freedom to choose whatever lin talents fit him for. Every English lawyer's experience, furnishes him with cases where a man was obliged to re

attorney who would have shone as a counsel, so also sug-
sts cases of persons who were believed, and with reason
lieved, by their friends to possess the highest forensic abili-
es, but literally never had the chance of displaying them,
d languished on in obscurity, while others in every way
ferior to them became, by mere dint of practice, fitter for
timate success. Quite otherwise in America. There, accord-
g to the universal witness of laymen and lawyers, no man
no combines fair talents with reasonable industry fails to
rn a competence, and to have, within the first six or seven
ars of his career, an opportunity of showing whether he
s in him the makings of something great. This is not due,
might be supposed, merely to the greater opportunities
nich everybody has in a new country, and which make Amer-
a the working man's paradise, for, in the Eastern States at
ast, the professions are nearly as crowded as they are in
ngland. It is owing to the greater variety of practice which
s open to a young man, and to the fact that his patrons are
e general public, and not as in England, a limited class who
ve their own friends and connections to push. Certain it is
at American lawyers profess themselves unable to under-
and how it can happen that deserving men remain briefless
r the best years of their life, and are at last obliged to quit
e profession in disgust.

A further result of the more free and open character of the
ofession may be seen in the absence of many of those rules
etiquette which are, in theory at least, observed by the
nglish lawyer. It is not thought undignified, except in the
eat cities of the Eastern States, for a counsel to advertise
mself in the newspapers.[1] He is allowed to make whatever
rgain he pleases with his client: he may do work for noth-
g, or may stipulate for a commission on the result of the
it or a share in whatever the verdict produces — a practice
nich is open to grave objections, and which, in the opinion
more than one eminent American lawyer, has produced a
od deal of the mischief which caused it to be seventeen cen-
ries ago prohibited at Rome. However, in some cities the
ntiment of the Bar seems to be opposed to the practice, and

[1] California has recently passed a statute forbidding counsel to advertise divorce cases.

in some States there are rules limiting it. A counsel except in New Jersey (a State curiously conservative in s points), bring an action for the recovery of his fees, and, *ratione*, can be sued for negligence in the conduct of a caus

A lawyer can readily gain admission to practise in the eral courts, and may by courtesy practise in the court every State. But each State has its own Bar, that is to there is no general or national organization of the legal fession, the laws regulating which are State laws, differin each of the forty-four commonwealths. In no State does t exist any body resembling the English Inns of Court, the right of admitting to the practice of public advocacy of exercising a disciplinary jurisdiction: and in very few any professional associations resembling the English Inco rated Law Society obtained statutory recognition. Usu the State law vests in the courts the duty of admitting sons as attorneys, and of excluding them if guilty of serious offence. But the oversight of the judges is necessa so lax that in many States and cities voluntary Bar Asso tions have been formed with the view of exercising a so censorship over the profession. Such associations can bl ball bad candidates for admission, and expel offenders aga professional honour; and they are said to accomplish s good in this way. More rarely they institute proceeding have black sheep removed from practice. Being virtuall open profession, like stockbroking or engineering, the pr sion has less of a distinctive character and corporate fe than the barristers of England or France have, and I t rather less than the solicitors of England have. Neither bands, gown, cap, nor any other professional costume is w and this circumstance, trivial as it may seem, no doubt tributes to weaken the sentiment of professional privilege dignity, and to obscure the distinction between the advo in his individual capacity and the advocate as an advo not deemed to be pledging himself to the truth of any or the soundness of any argument, but simply presenting client's case as it is presented to him.

In most States the judges impose some sort of examin on persons seeking to be admitted to practice, often delega the duty of questioning the candidate to two or three co

ıned for the purpose. Candidates are sometimes required have read for a certain period in a lawyer's office, but this ndition is easily evaded, and the examination, nowhere strict, often little better than a form or a farce. Notwithstanding is laxity, the level of legal attainment is in some cities as gh or higher than among either the barristers or the solici- rs of London. This is due to the extraordinary excellence many of the law schools. I do not know if there is any- ing in which America has advanced more beyond the mother untry than in the provision she makes for legal education.[1] hirty years ago, when there was nothing that could be called scientific school of law in England, the Inns of Court having actically ceased to teach law, and the universities having lowed their two or three old chairs to fall into neglect and ovided scarce any new ones, several American universities ssessed well-equipped law departments, giving a highly effi- ent instruction. Even now, when England has bestirred her- lf to make a more adequate provision for the professional aining of both barristers and solicitors, this provision seems significant beside that which we find in the United States, here, not to speak of minor institutions, all the leading uni- rsities possess law schools, in each of which every branch of nglo-American law, *i.e.* common law and equity as modified Federal and State constitutions and statutes, is taught by a rong staff of able men, sometimes including the most eminent wyers of the State.[2] Here at least the principle of demand d supply works to perfection. No one is obliged to attend ese courses in order to obtain admission to practice, and the aminations are generally too lax to require elaborate prepara- n. But the instruction is found so valuable, so helpful for

[1] Modern England seems to stand alone in her comparative neglect of the oretic study of law as a preparation for legal practice. Other countries, n Germany at the one end of the scale of civilization to the Mohammedan t at the other end, exact three, four, five, or even more years spent in this dy before the aspirant begins his practical work.

[2] This instruction is in most of the law schools confined to Anglo-American , omitting theoretic jurisprudence (*i.e.* the science of law in general), nan law, except, of course, in Louisiana, where the Civil Law is the basis he code, and international law. The latter subjects are, however, now inning to be more frequently taught, though sometimes placed in the orical curriculum. In some law schools much educational value is attrib- l to the moot courts in which the students are set to argue cases, a method ch in vogue in England two centuries ago.

professional success, that young men throng the lecture hal willingly spending two or three years in the scientific study the law which they might have spent in the chambers of practising lawyer as pupils or as junior partners. The indire results of this theoretic study in maintaining a philosophic interest in the law among the higher class of practitioners, a a higher sense of the dignity of their profession, are doul valuable in that absence of corporate organizations on which have already commented.[1]

In what may be called habits of legal thought, their way regarding legal questions, their attitude towards changes the form or substance of the law, American practitione while closely resembling their English brethren, seem on t whole more conservative. Such law reforms as have be effected in England during the last thirty years have mos come from the profession itself. They have been carri through Parliament by attorneys-general or lord-chancello usually with the tacit approval of the bar and the solicito The masses and their leaders have seldom ventured to l profane fingers on the law, either in despair of understandi it or because they saw nearer and more important work to done. Hence the profession has in England been seld roused to oppose projects of change; and its division into t branches, with interests sometimes divergent, weakens political influence. In the United States, although the legis tures are largely composed of lawyers, many of these ha little practice, little knowledge, comparatively little prof sional feeling. Hence there is usually a latent and sometir an open hostility between the better kind of lawyers and impulses of the masses, seeking probably at the instigation some lawyer of a demagogic turn to carry through le changes. The defensive attitude which the upper part of profession is thus led to assume fosters those conservat instincts which a system of case law engenders, and which

[1] Some of the best American law-books, as, for instance, that admir series which made Justice Story famous, have been produced as lectures g to students. Story was professor at Harvard while judge of the Supr court, and used to travel to and from Washington to give his lectures. A years ago there were several men in large practice who used to teach in law schools out of public spirit and from their love of the subject, rather in respect of the comparatively small payment they received.

rther stimulated by the habit of constantly recurring to a ndamental instrument, the Federal Constitution. Thus one nds the same dislike to theory, the same attachment to old rms, the same unwillingness to be committed to any broad rinciple which distinguished the orthodox type of English wyers sixty years ago. Prejudices survive on the shores of ie Mississippi which Bentham assailed seventy years ago hen those shores were inhabited by Indians and beavers; nd in Chicago, a place which living men remember as a lonely vamp, special demurrers, replications *de injuria*, and various aborate formalities of pleading which were swept away by ie English Common Law Procedure Acts of 1850 and 1852, ourish and abound to this day.

Is the American lawyer more like an English barrister or n English solicitor? This depends on the position he holds. he leading counsel of a city recall the former class, the aver- ge practitioners of the smaller places and rural districts the tter. But as every American lawyer has the right of advo- acy in the highest courts, and is accustomed to advise clients mself instead of sending a case for opinion to a counsel of minence, the level of legal knowledge — that is to say, knowl- dge of the principles and substance of the law, and not erely of the rules of practice — is somewhat higher than nong English solicitors, while the familiarity with details practice is more certain to be found than among English rristers. Neither an average barrister nor an average solici- r is so likely to have a good working all-round knowledge the whole field of common law, equity, admiralty law, pro- te law, patent law, as an average American city practitioner, or to be so smart and quick in applying his knowledge. On ie other hand, it must be admitted that England possesses ore men eminent as draftsmen, though perhaps fewer emi- nt in patent cases, and that much American business, espe- ally in State courts, is done in a way which European critics ight call lax and slovenly.

I have already observed that both in Congress and in most the State legislatures the lawyers outnumber the persons longing to other walks of life. Nevertheless, they have not at hold on politics now which they had in the first and sec- nd generations of the Republic. Politics have, in falling so

completely into the hands of party organizations, become mor distinctly a separate profession, and an engrossing professior which a man occupied with his clients cannot follow. Thu among the leading lawyers, the men who win wealth an honour by advocacy, comparatively few enter a legislativ body or become candidates for public office. Their influenc is still great when any question arises on which the professior or the more respectable part of it, stands together. Man bad measures have been defeated in State legislatures by th action of the Bar, many bad judicial appointments averte Their influence strengthens the respect of the people for th Constitution, and is felt by the judges when they are calle to deal with constitutional questions. But taking a gener survey of the facts of to-day, as compared with those of sixt years ago, it is clear that the Bar counts for less as a gui ing and restraining power, tempering the crudity or haste democracy by its attachment to rule and precedent, than did then.

A similar decline, due partly to this diminished politic authority, may be observed in its social position. In a cou try where there is no titled class, no landed class, no milita class, the chief distinction which popular sentiment can la hold of as raising one set of persons above another is the cha acter of their occupation, the degree of culture it implies, th extent to which it gives them an honourable prominenc Such distinctions carried great weight in the early days of th Republic, when society was smaller and simpler than it h now become. But of late years not only has the practice public speaking ceased to be, as it once was, almost the monopoly, not only has the direction of politics slipped great measure from their hands, but the growth of huge me cantile fortunes and of a financial class has, as in France a England, lowered the relative importance and dignity of t Bar. An individual merchant holds perhaps no better pla compared with an average individual lawyer than he did for years ago; but the millionaire is a much more frequent a potent personage than he was then, and outshines everybo in the country. Now and then a brilliant orator or writ achieves fame of a different and higher kind; but in the ma it is the glory of successful commerce which in America a

Europe now draws wondering eyes. Wealth, it is true, is by o means out of the reach of the leading lawyers: yet still ot such wealth as may be and constantly is amassed by con-ractors, railwaymen, financial speculators, hotel proprietors, ewspaper owners, and retail storekeepers. The incomes of he first counsel in cities like New York are probably as large s those of the great English leaders. I have heard firms men-ioned as dividing a sum of $250,000 (£50,000) a year, of hich the senior member may probably have $100,000. It is, owever, only in two or three of the greatest cities that such ncomes can be made, and possibly not more than fifteen coun-el in the whole country make by their profession more than 50,000 a year. Next after wealth, education may be taken o be the element or quality on which social standing in a urely democratic country depends. In this respect the Bar anks high. Most lawyers have had a college training, and re, by the necessity of their employment, persons of some ental cultivation; in the older towns they, with the leading lergy, form the intellectual *élite* of the place, and maintain orthily the literary traditions of the Roman, French, English, nd Scottish bars. But education is so much more diffused an formerly, and cheap literature so much more abundant, at they do not stand so high above the multitude as they nce did. It may, however, still be said that the law is the rofession which an active youth of intellectual tastes naturally kes to, that a large proportion of the highest talent of the ountry may be found in its ranks, and that almost all the first tatesmen of the present and the last generation have belonged o it, though many soon resigned its practice. It is also ne of the links which best serves to bind the United States o England. The interest of the higher class of American wyers in the English law, bar, and judges, is wonderfully fresh nd keen. An English barrister, if properly authenticated, is elcomed as a brother of the art, and finds the law reports of s own country as sedulously read and as acutely criticised as e would in the Temple.[1]

[1] American lawyers remark that the English Law Reports have become less eful since the number of decisions upon the construction of statutes has so eatly increased. They complain of the extreme difficulty of keeping abreast the vast multitude of cases reported in their own country, from the courts forty-four States as well as Federal courts.

I have left to the last the question which a stranger finds it most difficult to answer. The legal profession has in every country, apart from its relation to politics, very important functions to discharge in connection with the administration of justice. Its members are the confidential advisers of private persons, and the depositaries of their secrets. They have it in their power to promote or to restrain vexatious litigation, to become accomplices in chicane, or to check the abuse of legal rights in cases where morality may require men to abstain from exacting all that the letter of the law allows. They can exercise a powerful influence upon the magistracy by shaming an unjust judge, or by misusing the ascendency which they may happen to possess over a weak judge, or a judge who has something to hope for from them. Does the profession in the United States rise to the height of these functions, and in maintaining its own tone, help to maintain the tone of the community, especially of the mercantile community, which under the pressure of competition, seldom observes a higher moral standard than that which the law exacts? So far as my limited opportunities for observation enable me to answer this question, I should answer it by saying that the profession taken as a whole, seems to stand on a level with the profession also taken as a whole, in England. But I am bound to add that some judicious American observers hold that the last thirty years have witnessed a certain decadence in the Bar of the greater cities. They say that the growth of enormously rich and powerful corporations, willing to pay vast sums for questionable services, has seduced the virtue of some counsel whose eminence makes their example important, and that in a few States the degradation of the Bench has led to secret understandings between judges and counsel for the perversion of justice.

As the question of fusing the two branches of the legal profession into one body has been of late much canvassed in England, a few words may be expected as to the light which American experience throws upon it.

There are two sets of persons in England who complain of the present arrangements — a section of the solicitors, who are debarred from the exercise of advocacy, and therefore from the great prizes of the profession; and a section of the junior bar

hose members, depending entirely on the patronage of the olicitors, find themselves, if they happen to have no private onnections among that branch of the profession, unable to get mployment, since a code of etiquette forbids them to under- ake certain sorts of work, or to do work except on a fixed cale of fees, or to take court work directly from a client, or o form partnerships with other counsel. Attempts have also een made to enlist the general public in favour of a change, y the argument that law would be cheapened if the attorney ere allowed to argue and carry through the courts a cause hich he has prepared for trial.

There are three points of view from which the merits or de- erits of a change may be regarded. These are the interests espectively of the profession, of the client, and of the com- unity at large.

As far as the advantage of the individual members of the rofession is concerned, the example of the United States eems to show that the balance of advantage is in favour of niting barristers and attorneys in one body. The attorney ould have a wider field, greater opportunities of distinguish- ng himself, and the legitimate satisfaction of seeing his cause hrough all its stages. The junior barrister would find it asier to get on, even as an advocate, and, if he discovered hat advocacy was not his line, could subside into the perhaps ot less profitable function of a solicitor. The senior barrister r leader might, however, suffer, for his attention would be ore distracted by calls of different kinds.

The gain to the client is still clearer; and even those (very ew) American counsel who say that for their own sake they ould prefer the English plan, admit that the litigant is more xpeditiously and effectively served where he has but one erson to look to and deal with throughout. It does not suit im, say the Americans, to be lathered in one shop and shaved another; he likes to go to his lawyer, tell him the facts, et an off-hand opinion, if the case be a simple one (as it is ne times out of ten), and issue his writ with some confi- ence: whereas under the English system he might either ave to wait till a regular case for the opinion of counsel was rawn, sent to a barrister, and returned, written on, after some ays, or else take the risk of bringing an action which turned

out to be ill-founded. It may also be believed that a case i on the whole, better dealt with when it is kept in one offi from first to last, and managed by one person, or by partne who are in constant communication. Mistakes and oversigh are less likely to occur, since the advocate knows the fac better, and has almost invariably seen and questioned th witnesses before he comes into court. It may indeed be sa that an advocate does his work with more ease of conscienc and perhaps more *sang-froid*, when he knows nothing but h instructions. But American practitioners are all clear th they are able to serve their clients better than they could the responsibility were divided between the man who prepar the case, and the man who argues or addresses the jur Indeed, I have often heard them say that they could n understand how English counsel, who rarely see the witness beforehand, were able to conduct witness causes satisfactoril

If, however, we go on to ask what is the result to the who community of having no distinction between the small body advocates and the large body of attorneys, approval will more hesitating. Society is interested in the maintenance a high tone among those who have that influence on the admi istration of justice and the standard of commercial morali which has been already adverted to. It is easier to mainta such a tone in a small body, which can be kept under a co paratively strict control and cultivate a warm profession feeling than in a large body, many of whose members a practically just as much men of business as lawyers. And may well be thought that the conscience or honour of a me ber of either branch of the profession is exposed to less stra where the two branches are kept distinct. The counsel under less temptation to win his cause by doubtful mea since he is removed from the client by the interposition of t attorney, and therefore less personally identified with t client's success. He probably has not that intimate kno edge of the client's affairs which he must have if he had p pared the whole case, and is therefore less likely to be dra into speculating, to take an obvious instance, in the shares a client company, or otherwise playing a double and dislo game. Similarly it may be thought that the attorney also less tempted than if he appeared himself in court, and w

ot obliged, in carrying out the schemes of a fraudulent client, o call in the aid of another practitioner, amenable to a strict rofessional discipline. Where the advocate is also the attor-ey, he may be more apt, when he sees the witnesses, to lead hem, perhaps unconsciously, to stretch their recollection; nd it is harder to check the practice of paying for legal ervices by a share of the proceeds of the action.

Looking at the question as a whole, I doubt whether a tudy of the American arrangements is calculated to com-hend them for imitation, or to induce England to allow her istoric bar to be swallowed up and vanish in the more umerous branch of the profession. Those arrangements, how-ver, suggest some useful minor changes in the present English ules. The passage from each branch to the other might be ade easier; barristers might be permitted to form open (as hey now sometimes do covert) partnerships among them-elves; students of both branches might be educated and xamined together in the professional law schools as they ow are, with admittedly good results, in the universities.

CHAPTER CII

THE BENCH

So much has already been said regarding the constituti and jurisdiction of the various courts, Federal and State, th what remains to be stated regarding the judicial bench ne refer only to its personal and social side. What is the soci standing of the judges, the average standard of their learni and capacity, their integrity and fidelity in the discharge functions whose gravity seems to increase with the growth wealth?

The English reader who wishes to understand the Americ judiciary ought to begin by realizing the fact that his conce tion of a judge is purely English, not applicable to any oth country. For some centuries Englishmen have associat the ideas of power, dignity, and intellectual eminence wi the judicial office; a tradition, shorter no doubt, but still respectable length, has made them regard it as incorruptib The judges are among the greatest permanent officials of t state. They have earned their place by success, more or le brilliant, but most always considerable, in the struggles of t Bar; they are removable by the Crown only upon an addre of both Houses of Parliament; they enjoy large incomes a great social respect. Some of them sit in the House of Lord some are members of the Privy Council. When they trave the country on their circuits, they are received by the Hi Sheriff of each county with the ceremonious pomp of t Middle Ages, and followed hither and thither by admiri crowds. The criticisms of an outspoken press rarely ass their ability, hardly ever their fairness. Even the Bar, wh watches them daily, which knows all their ins and outs (to an American phrase) both before and after their elevati treats them with more respect than is commonly shown by

ergy to the bishops. Thus the English form their concep-
on of the judge as a personage necessarily and naturally dig-
fied and upright; and, having formed it, they carry it abroad
th them like their notions of land tenure and other insular
nceptions, and are astonished when they find that it does
t hold in other countries. It is a fine and fruitful concep-
on, and one which one might desire to see accepted every-
here, though it has been secured at the cost of compelling
igants to carry to London much business which in other
untries would have been dealt with in local courts. But it
peculiar to England; the British judge is as abnormal as the
itish Constitution, and owes his character to a not less curi-
s and complex combination of conditions. In most parts of
e Continent the judge, even of the superior courts, does not
ld a very high social position. He is not chosen from the
nks of the Bar, and has not that community of feeling with
which England has found so valuable. Its leaders outshine
m in France; the famous professors of law often exert a
eater authority in Germany. His independence, and even
rity, are not always above suspicion. In no part of Europe
his wishes and opinions carry the same weight, or does he
mmand the same deference as in England. The English
ght not, therefore, to be surprised at finding him in America
fferent from what they expect, for it is not so much his in-
iority there that is exceptional as his excellence in England.
In America, the nine Federal judges of the Supreme court
ain much of the dignity which surrounds the English Su-
eme Court of Judicature. They are almost the only officials
no are appointed for life, and their functions are of the
most importance to the smooth working of the Constitution.
cordingly great public interest is felt in the choice of a
dge, and the post is an object of ambition. Though now
d then an eminent lawyer may decline it because he is
eady making by practice five times as much as the salary
carries, still there has been no difficulty in finding first-rate
en to fill the court. The minor Federal judges are usually
rsons of ability and experience. They are inadequately
id, but the life tenure makes the place desired and secures
pect for it.

Of the State judges it is hard to speak generally, because

there are great differences between State and State. In six seven commonwealths, of which Massachusetts is the best ample among Eastern and Michigan among Western States, th stand high — that is to say, the post attracts a prospero barrister though he will lose in income, or a law profess though he must sacrifice his leisure. But in some States it otherwise. A place on the bench of the superior courts carri little honour, and commands but slight social considerati It is lower than that of an English county court judge or stipe diary magistrate, or of a Scotch sheriff-substitute. It raises presumption that its holder is able or cultivated or trusted his fellow-citizens. He may be all of these, but if so, it is respect of his personal merits that he will be valued, not his official position. Often he stands below the leading me bers of the State or city bar in all these points and does move in the best society.[1] Hence a leading counsel seld accepts the post, and men often resign a judgeship, or wh their term of office expires do not seek re-election, but retu to practice at the bar.[2] Hence, too, a judge is not expected set an example of conformity to the conventional standards decorum. No one is surprised to see him in low company, to hear, in the ruder parts of the South and West, that took part in a shooting affray. He is as welcome to be child of nature and of freedom" as any private citizen.

The European reader may think that these facts not o betoken but tend to perpetuate a low standard of learning a capacity among the State judges, and from this low stand he will go on to conclude that justice must be badly adm istered, and will ask with surprise why an intelligent a practical people allow this very important part of their pul work to be ill discharged. I shrink from making posit statements on so large a matter as the administration of just

[1] A prominent New Yorker once said to me, speaking of one of the c judges of the city, "I don't think him such a bad fellow; he has always very friendly to me, and would give me a midnight injunction or do anyt else for me at a moment's notice. And he's not an ill-natured man. Bu course, he's the last person I should dream of asking to my house." Th are better in New York to-day.

[2] Most States are full of ex-judges practising at the bar, the title b continued as a matter of courtesy to the person who has formerly enj it, and sometimes even extended to an elderly counsel who has never sa the bench. For social purposes, once a judge, always a judge.

er a vast country whose States differ in many respects. But far as I could ascertain, civil justice is better administered an might be expected from the character which the Bench ars in most of the States. In the Federal courts and in the perior courts of the six or seven States just mentioned it is ual to the justice dispensed in the superior courts of England, ance, and Germany. In the remainder it is inferior, that is say, civil trials, whether the issue be of law or of fact, more quently give an unsatisfactory result; the opinions de- ered by the judges are wanting in scientific accuracy, and e law becomes loose and uncertain.[1] This inferiority is re or less marked according to the general tone of the ate, the better States taking more pains to secure respectable n. That it is everywhere less marked than *a priori* reason- rs would have suggested, may be ascribed partly to the way rewd juries have of rendering substantially just verdicts, ctly to the ability of the Bar, whose arguments make up a judge's want of learning, by giving him the means of ching a sound decision, partly to that native acuteness Americans which enables them to handle any sort of prac- al work, roughly perhaps, but well enough for the absolute eds of the case. The injury to the quality of State law is igated by the fact that abundance of good law is produced the Federal courts, by the highest courts of the best States, l by the judges of England, whose reported decisions are quently referred to. Having constantly questioned those net on the subject, I have heard comparatively few com- ints from commercial men as to the inefficiency of State unals, and not many even from the leading lawyers, though ir interest in the scientific character of law makes them ere critics of current legislation, and opponents of these emes for codifying the common law which have been gled before the multitude in several States. It is other- e as regards criminal justice. It is accused of being slow, certain, and unduly lenient both to crimes of violence and commercial frauds. Yet the accusers charge the fault less the judges than on the weakness of juries,[2] and on the

[1] The last Constitution of California requires the judges of the higher courts ive their decisions in writing.

[2] There are places where the purity of juries is not above suspicion. New

facilities for escape which a cumbrous and highly techn procedure, allowing numerous opportunities for interpo delays and raising points of law, provides for prisoners.[1] dulgence to prisoners is now as marked as harshness to t was in England before the days of Bentham and Romilly. legislatures must bear the blame of this procedure, the stronger men on the Bench would more often overrule tri points of law and expedite convictions.

The causes which have lowered the quality of the S judges have been referred to in previous chapters. She stated they are: the smallness of the salaries paid, the lim tenure of office, often for seven years only, and the metho appointment, nominally by popular election, practically by agency of party wirepullers. The first two causes have vented the ablest lawyers, the last often prevents the h honourable men, from seeking the post. All are the resu democratic theory, of the belief in equality and popular so eignty pushed to extremes. And this theory has aggrav the mischief in withdrawing from the judge, when it appointed him, those external badges of dignity which, chil as they may appear to the philosopher, have power over imagination of the mass of mankind, and are not witho useful reflex influence on the person whom they surround, ing his sense of his position, and reminding him of its res sibilities. No American magistrate, except the judges of

York has recently created a new office, that of Warden of the Grand As a distinguished lawyer observed in mentioning this, *Quis custodi et custodem?*

[1] Even judges suffer from this misplaced leniency. I heard of a case happened in Kentucky a few years ago. A decree of foreclosure wa nounced by a respected judge against a defendant of good local f connections. The judge could not do otherwise than pronounce it, for was practically no defence. As the judge was walking from the court railway station the same afternoon the defendant, who was waiting the road, shot him dead. It was hard to avoid arresting and trying guilty of so flagrant an offence, so arrested he was, tried, and convicted on an allegation of lunacy being put forward, the Court of Appeals ord new trial; he was acquitted on the ground of insanity, under instru based on the opinion of an appellate court, and presently allowed to into Ohio from the asylum to which he had been consigned. There was told, a good deal of sympathy for him.

Cheisly of Dairy, the father of the famous Lady Grange, got into t in Scotland early in last century for shooting a judge who had decided a him, but was not so indulgently dealt with.

preme court when sitting at Washington, and those of the ermediate Federal Courts of Appeal, the judges of the New rk Court of Appeals at Albany, and those of the Supreme rt of Pennsylvania, wears any robe of office or other dis-tive dress, or has any attendant to escort him,[1] or is in any pect treated differently from an ordinary citizen. Popular timent tolerates nothing that seems to elevate a man above fellows, even when his dignity is really the dignity of the ple who have put him where he is. I remember in New York ler the reign of Boss Tweed to have been taken into one of courts. An ill-omened looking man, flashily dressed, and e in demeanour, was sitting behind a table, two men in nt were addressing him, the rest of the room was given up disorder. Had one not been told that he was a judge of highest court of the city, one might have taken him for riminal. His jurisdiction was unlimited in amount, and ugh an appeal lay from him to the Court of Appeals of the te, his power of issuing injunctions put all the property in district at his mercy. This was what democratic theory brought New York to. For the change which that State le in 1846 was a perfectly wanton change. No practical ect was to be gained by it. There had been an excellent ich, adorned, as it happened, by one of the greatest judges modern times, the illustrious Chancellor Kent. But the vention of 1846 thought that the power of the people was fficiently recognized while judges were named by the Gov-or and Council, and held office for life, so theory was obeyed. e Convention in its circular address announced, in proposing election of judges for five years by the voters of the dis-t, that "the happiness of the people of this State will hence-h, under God, be in their own hands." But the quest of a re perfect freedom and equality on which the Convention ted the people gave them in twenty-five years Judge Bar-d instead of Chancellor Kent.

The limited attainments of the Bench in many States, and conspicuous inferiority to the counsel who practise before are, however, less serious evils than the corruption with

[1] Save that in the rural counties of Massachusetts and possibly of some other New England States, the sheriff, as in England, escorts the judges to and from the Court-house.

which it is often charged. Nothing has done so much to
credit American institutions in Europe as the belief that
fountains of justice are there generally polluted; nor is th
any point on which a writer treating of the United Sta
would more desire to be able to set forth incontrovertible fa
Unluckily, this is just what from the nature of the case can
be done as regards some parts of the country. There is
doubt as to the purity of most States, but as to others it
extremely hard to test the rumours that are current. I g
such results as careful inquiries in many districts have e
bled me to reach.

The Federal judges are above suspicion. I do not know t
any member of the Supreme court or any Circuit judge
been ever accused of corruption; nor have the allegations o
sionally made against some of the southern District Fed
judges been, except in one instance, seriously pressed.

The State judges have been and are deemed honest and
partial in nearly all the Northern and most of the Southern
Western States. In a few of these States, such as Massa
setts, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, the Bench has within
present generation included men who would do credit to
court in any country. Even in other States an eminent ma
occasionally found, as in England there are some County C
judges who are sounder lawyers and abler men than som
the persons whom political favour has of late years been un
pily permitted to raise to the bench of the High Court.

In a few States, perhaps six or seven in all, suspicions
at one time or another within the last twenty years attache
one or more of the superior judges. Sometimes these su
cions may have been ill-founded.[1] But though I know of

[1] A recent Western instance shows how suspicions may arise. A p
living in the capital of the State used his intimacy with the superior ju
most of whom were in the habit of occasionally dining with him, to lea
gants to believe that his influence with the Bench would procure for
favourable decisions. Considerable sums were accordingly given him to s
his good word. When the litigant obtained the decision he desired, the m
given was retained. When the case went against him, the confidant c
Bench was delicately scrupulous in handing it back, saying that as his
ence had failed to prevail, he could not possibly think of keeping the m
Everything was done in the most secret and confidential way, and it wa
till after the death of this judicious dinner-giver that it was discovered
he had never spoken to the judges about law-suits at all, and that the
lain under a groundless suspicion of sharing the gains their friend had ma

e case in which they have been substantiated, there can be tle doubt that in several instances improprieties have been nmitted. The judge may not have taken a bribe, but he has rverted justice at the instance of some person or persons ho either gave him a consideration or exercised an undue in- ence over him. It would not follow that in such instances e whole Bench was tainted; indeed I have never heard of a ate in which more than two or three judges were the objects distrust at the same time.[1]

In one State, viz. New York, in 1869–71, there were flagrant ndals which led to the disappearance of three justices of the perior courts who had unquestionably both sold and denied stice. The Tweed Ring, when masters of New York City d engaged in plundering its treasury, found it convenient to ve in the seat of justice accomplices who might check inquiry o their misdeeds. This the system of popular elections for y short terms enabled them to do; and men were accord- gly placed on the Bench whom one might rather have expected see in the dock — bar-room loafers, broken-down Tombs[2] at- neys, needy adventurers whose want of character made them solutely dependent on their patrons. Being elected for eight ars only, these fellows were obliged to purchase re-election constant subservience to the party managers. They did regard social censure, for they were already excluded from cent society; impeachment had no terrors for them, since State legislature, as well as the executive machinery of the y, was in the hands of their masters. It would have been n to expect such people, without fear of God or man before ir eyes, to resist the temptations which capitalists and verful companies could offer.

To what precise point of infamy they descended I cannot

[1] For instance, there is a Western State in which a year or two ago there one, but only one, of the superior judges whose integrity was doubted. So e secret was made of the matter, that when a very distinguished English yer visited the city, and was taken to see the Courts sitting, the newspapers ounced the fact next day as follows: —

"Lord X. in the city,
He has seen Judge Y."

A statute of Arizona prescribes a change of venue, where an affidavit is le alleging that a judge is biassed.

[2] The Tombs is the name of the city prison of New York, round which yers of the lowest class hover in the hope of picking up defences.

attempt, among so many discordant stories and rumours, determine. It is, however, beyond a doubt that they ma orders in defiance of the plainest rules of practice; issued rum-shops, injunctions which they had not even read ov appointed notorious vagabonds receivers of valuable property turned over important cases to a friend of their own stan and gave whatever decision he suggested. There were me bers of the Bar who could obtain from these magistrates wh ever order or decree they chose to ask for. A leading lawy and man of high character said to me in 1870, "When a cli brings me a suit which is before —— (naming a judge), I f myself bound to tell him that though I will take it if he pleas he had much better give it to So-and-So (naming a lawyer), we all know that he owns that judge." A system of cli robbery had sprung up, by which each judge enriched the k of disreputable lawyers who surrounded him; he referred ca to them, granted them monstrous allowances in the name costs, gave them receiverships with a large percentage, and forth; they in turn either at the time sharing the booty w him, or undertaking to do the same for him when he sho have descended to the Bar and they have climbed to the Ben Nor is there any doubt that criminals who had any claim their party often managed to elude punishment. The pol it was said, would not arrest such an offender if they co help it; the District Attorney would avoid prosecuting; court officials, if public opinion had forced the attorney to would try to pack the jury; the judge, if the jury seer honest, would do his best to procure an acquittal; and if spite of police, attorney, officials, and judge, the criminal convicted and sentenced, he might still hope that the influe of his party would procure a pardon from the governor of

[1] "In the minds of certain New York judges," said a well-known write that time, "the old-fashioned distinction between a receiver of property Court of Equity and a receiver of stolen goods at common law may be sa have been lost." The abuses of judicial authority were mostly perpetrate the exercise of equitable jurisdiction, which is no doubt the most delicate of a judge's work, not only because there is no jury, but because the effe an injunction may be irremediable, whereas a decision on the main que may be reversed on appeal. In Scotland some of the local courts have a j diction unlimited in amount, but no action can be taken on an interdict is by such a court if an appeal is made with due promptness to the Cou Session.

ate, or enable him in some other way to slip out of the asp of justice. For governor, judge, attorney, officials, and lice were all of them party nominees; and if a man cannot unt on being helped by his party at a pinch, who will be thful to his party?

Although these malpractices diverted a good deal of busiss from the courts to private arbitration, the damage to the gular course of civil justice was much less than might have en expected. The guilty judges were but three in number, d there is no reason to think that even they decided unjustly an ordinary commercial suit between man and man, or took rect money bribes from one of the parties to such a suit. The ter opinion seems to be that it was only where the inence of a political party or of some particular persons came that injustice was perpetrated, and the truth, I believe, was oken by another judge, an honest and worthy man, who in talk; to me at the time of the most unblushing among these offend-, said, "Well, I don't much like ——; he is certainly a bad low, with very little delicacy of mind. He'll give you an unction without hearing what it's about. But I don't think takes money down from everybody." In the instance ich made most noise in Europe, that of the Erie Railroad ts, there was no need to give bribes. The gang of thieves o had gained control of the line and were "watering" its ck were leagued with the political "ringsters" who ruled city and nominated the judges; and nobody doubts that monstrous decisions in these suits were obtained by the luence of the Tammany leaders over their judicial minions. The fall of the Tammany Ring was swiftly followed by the peachment or resignation of these judges, and no similar ndal has since disgraced the Empire State, though it must confessed that some of the criminal courts of the city would more worthily presided over if they were "taken out of itics." At present New York appoints her chief city judges fourteen years and pays them a large salary, so she gets rly good if not first-rate men. Unhappily the magnitude of s one judicial scandal, happening in the greatest city of the ion, and the one which Europeans hear most of, has thrown r the integrity of the American Bench a shadow which does at injustice to it as a whole.

Although judicial purity has of late years come to be deer an indispensable accompaniment of high civilization, it is which has been realized in very few times and countr Hesiod complained that the kings who heard the cause betw himself and his brother received gifts to decide against h Felix expected to get money for loosing St. Paul. Am Orientals to this day an incorruptible magistrate is a rare ception.[1] In England a lord chancellor was removed for t ing bribes as late as the time of George I. In Spain, Portu Russia, parts of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, and ever Italy, the judges, except perhaps those of the highest co are not assumed by general opinion to be above suspic Many are trusted individually, but the office is not deemed guarantee the honour of its occupant. Yet in all these co tries the judges are appointed by the government, and h either for life or at its pleasure,[2] whereas in America suspic has arisen only in States where popular election preva that is to say, where the responsibility for a bad appointm cannot be fixed on any one person. The shortcomings of Bench in these States do not therefore indicate unsoundn in the general tone either of the people or of the profess from whom the offenders have been taken, but are the nat result of a system which, so far from taking precautions place worthy persons on the seat of justice, has left the ch of them in four cases out of five to a secret combination wirepullers. Thus we may note with satisfaction that present tendency is not only to make judges more independ by lengthening their term of office but to withdraw their pointment from popular vote and restore it to the gover from whom, as a responsible officer, the public may exact utmost care in the selection of able and upright men.

[1] In Egypt I was told in 1888, that there might be here and there amon native judges a man who did not take bribes, but probably not more two or three in the whole country. Things are, however, now mending t

[2] There is the important difference between these countries and Eng that in all of them not only is little or no use made of the civil jury, but p opinion is less active and justice more localized, *i.e.* a smaller proporti important suits are brought before the supreme courts of the capital. centralization of English justice, costly to suitors, has contributed to r law more pure as well as more scientific.

CHAPTER CIII

RAILROADS

No one will expect to find in a book like this a description that prodigy of labour, wealth, and skill — the American lway system. Of its management, its finance, its commerl prospects, I do not attempt to speak. But railroads, and ose who own and control them, occupy a place in the politi- and social life of the country which requires some passing rds, for it is a place far more significant than similar enterses have obtained in the Old World.

The United States are so much larger, and have a popula- n so much more scattered than any European state that they end even more upon means of internal communication. It these communications that hold the country together, and der it one for all social and political purposes as well as for mmerce. They may indeed be said to have made the West, it is along the lines of railway that the West has been set- l, and population still follows the rails, stretching out to th and north of the great trunk lines wherever they send a branch. The Americans are an eminently locomotive ple. Were statistics on such a point attainable, they would bably show that the average man travels over thrice as ny miles by steam in a year as the average Englishman, six es as many as the average Frenchman or German. The w Yorker thinks of a journey to Chicago (900 miles) as a ndoner of a journey to Glasgow (400 miles); and a family St. Louis will go for sea-bathing to Cape May, a journey of nty-five or forty hours, as readily as a Birmingham family s to Scarborough. The movements of goods traffic are on gantic scale. The greatest branch of heavy freight transtation in England, that of coal from the north and west to ndon, is not to be compared to the weight of cotton, grain,

bacon, cattle, fruit, and ores which comes from the inl regions to the Atlantic coast. This traffic does not me give to the trunk lines an enormous yearly turnover, interests all classes, I might almost say all individuals railway operations, seeing that every branch of industry every profession except divinity and medicine is more or directly connected with the movements of commerce, prospers in proportion to its prosperity. Consequently, roads and their receipts, railroad directors and their doi occupy men's tongues and pens to a far greater extent tha Europe.

Some of the great railway companies possess yet anot source of wealth and power. At the time when they v formed the enterprise of laying down rails in thinly-peop or perhaps quite uninhabited regions, in some instances deserts or across lofty mountains, seemed likely to prov unremunerative to the first shareholders, yet so beneficia the country at large, that Congress was induced to encou the promoters by vast grants of unoccupied land, the prop of the United States, lying along the projected line.[1] grants were often improvident, and they gave rise to end lobbying and intrigue, first to secure them, then to keep t from being declared forfeited in respect of some breach of conditions imposed by Congress on the company. Howe the lines were made, colonists came, much of the lands been sold, to speculators as well as to individual settlers; much long remained in the hands of two or three compa These gifts made the railroads great landowners, gave the local influence and divers local interests besides those ari from their proper business of carriers, and brought them intimate and often perilously delicate relations with lea politicians.

No wonder, then, that the railroads, even those that hel land beyond that on which their rails ran, acquired imm

[1] These grants usually consisted of alternate sections, in the earlier of five to the mile along the line. The total grant made to the Union P Railway was 13,000,100 acres; to the Kansas Pacific, 6,000,000; to the C Pacific, 12,100,100; to the Northern Pacific, 47,000,000; to the Atlanti Pacific, 42,000,000; to the Southern Pacific, 9,520,000. Enormous money sidies, exceeding $60,000,000, were also granted by Congress to the first continental lines.

wer in the districts they traversed. In a new and thinly-
opled State the companies were by far the wealthiest bodies,
d able by their wealth to exert all sorts of influence. A city
a district of country might depend entirely upon them for
progress. If they ran a line into it or through it, emigrants
lowed, the value of fixed property rose, trade became brisk:
they passed it by, and bestowed transportation facilities on
ne other district, it saw itself outstripped and began to
guish. If a company owned a trunk line it could, by raising
lowering the rates of freight on that line through which the
ducts of the district or State passed towards the sea, stimu-
e or retard the prosperity of the agricultural population, or
miners, or the lumbermen. That is to say, the great com-
nies held in their hands the fortunes of cities, of counties,
en sometimes of States and Territories.[1] California was for
ny years practically at the mercy of the Central Pacific Rail-
y, then her only road to the Mississippi Valley and the
lantic. Oregon and Washington were almost equally de-
ndent upon the Oregon Railroad and Navigation Company,
l afterwards upon the Northern Pacific. What made the
ition more singular was that, although these railroads had
en built under statutes passed by the State they traversed
, in the case of Territories, wholly or partially under Federal
tutes), they were built with Eastern capital, and were owned
a number, often a small number, of rich men living in New
rk, Boston, or Philadelphia, unamenable to local influences,
l caring no more about the wishes and feelings of the State
ence their profits came than an English bondholder cares
ut the feelings of Chili. Moreover, although the railroads
d a fuller sway in the newer States, they were sometimes
ent political factors in the older ones. In 1870 I often
rd men say, "Camden and Amboy (the Camden and Amboy
lroad) rules New Jersey." In New York the great New
k Central Railroad, in Pennsylvania the Pennsylvania
lroad under its able chief, exerted immense influence with
legislature, partly by their wealth, partly by the oppor-

[1] This was of course especially the case with the newer Western States; yet in the older parts of the country any very large railway system had great power, for it might have a monopoly of communication; or if there were two they might have agreed to "pool," as it is called, their traffic receipts work in harmony.

tunities of bestowing favours on individuals and localit which they possessed, including the gift of free passes a possibly influence exercised on the votes of their employ Sometimes, at least in Pennsylvania and New York, they ev threw their weight into the scale of a political party, givi it money as well as votes. But more commonly they ha confined themselves to securing their own interests, a obliged, or threatened and used, the State leaders of bo parties alike for that purpose. The same sort of power w at one time exerted over some of the cantons of Switzerla by the greater Swiss railway companies; though, since t Constitution of 1874, it is said to have quite disappeared.[1]

In such circumstances conflicts between the railroads a the State governments were inevitable. The companies mig succeed in "capturing" individual legislators or committ of either or both Houses, but they could not silence the c contented cities or counties who complained of the way which they were neglected while some other city obtai better facilities, still less the farmers who denounced the duly high rates they were forced to pay for the carriage their produce. Thus a duel began between the companies a the peoples of some of the States, which has gone on w varying fortune in the halls of the legislatures and in courts of law. The farmers of the North-west formed agri tural associations called "Patrons of Husbandry," or popula "Granges," and passed a number of laws imposing vari restrictions on the railroads, and providing for the fix of a maximum scale of charges. But although the railr companies had been formed under, and derived their pow of taking land and making by-laws from, State statu these statutes had in some cases omitted to reserve right to deal freely with the lines by subsequent legi tion; and the companies therefore attempted to resist "Granger laws" as being unconstitutional. They were defea by two famous decisions of the Supreme Federal court 1876,[2] establishing the right of a State to impose restricti on public undertakings in the nature of monopolies. But

[1] The Swiss railways are now under the control of the Federal Governm

[2] See *Munn* v. *Illinois*, and *Peake* v. *Chicago, Burlington, and Qu Railroad*, 94 U. S. Reports.

her directions they had better luck. The Granger laws oved in many respects unworkable. The companies, alleg- g that they could not carry goods at a loss, vexed the people refusing to construct branches and other new lines, and in rious ways contrived to make the laws difficult of execution. ius they procured (in most States) the repeal of the first set Granger laws; and when further legislation was projected, cret engines of influence were made to play upon the legisla- res, influences which, since the first wave of popular impulse d now spent itself, often proved efficacious in averting rther restrictions or impeding the enforcement of those posed. Those who profited most by the strife were the less rupulous among the legislators, who, if they did not receive me favour from a railroad, could levy blackmail upon it by inging in a threatening bill.[1]

The contest, however, was not confined to the several States. passed to Congress. Congress has no authority under the nstitution to deal with a railway lying entirely within one ate, but is held entitled to legislate, under its power of regu- ing commerce between different States, for all lines (includ- g connecting lines which are worked together as a through ie) which traverse more than one State. And of course it s always had power over railways situate in the Territories. the Federal courts decided a few years ago that no State uld legislate against a railway lying partly outside its own nits, because this would trench on Federal competence, the ed for Federal legislation, long pressed upon Congress, came urgent; and after much debate an Act was passed in 87 establishing an Inter-State Commerce Commission, with wer to regulate railroad transportation and charges in many terial respects. The companies had opposed it; but after passage they discovered that it hurt them less than they d feared, and in some points even benefited them; for having ohibited all discriminations and secret rebates, and required em to adhere to their published list of charges, it has given em a ready answer to demands for exceptional privileges.[2]

[1] A few years ago the legislature of Iowa passed a statute giving the State lway Commission full powers to fix charges; and injunctions were obtained m the Courts restraining the Commission from imposing, as they were ceeding to do, rates so low as to be destructive of reasonable profits.

[2] It also attempted, though as yet with incomplete success, to put an end to

The time has hardly yet come for estimating the results
this momentous statute, but it cannot be pronounced a succes
for it has given rise to a swarm of difficult legal question
and while hampering the railroads has scarcely lessened th
complaints of the farming and commercial classes. That th
railroads had exercised autocratic and irresponsible pow
over some regions of the country, and had occasionally abus
this power, especially by imposing discriminations in the
freight charges, is not to be denied.[1] They had become e
tremely unpopular, a constant theme for demagogic denunci
tions; and their success during some years in resisting publ
clamour by their secret control of legislatures, or even of t
State commissioners appointed to deal with them, increas
the irritation. All corporations are at present unpopular
America, and especially corporations possessed of monopoli
The agitation will apparently continue, though the confiden
felt in the honesty of the Commission has done something
allay it, and attempts be made to carry still more stringe
legislation. There is even a section of opinion which desi
to see all railways, as well as telegraphs, in the hands
the nation, and that not merely for revenue purposes, b
to make them serve more perfectly the public convenien
The objection which to most men seems decisive agai
any such arrangement is that it would not only encumb
government with most difficult rate-problems, affecting loc
interests, and therefore involving the certainty of local poli
cal pressure, but would also throw a stupendous mass
patronage and power into the hands of the party for t
time being holding office. Considering what a perenn
spring of bitterness partisan patronage has been, and h
liable to perversion under the best regulations patrona
must always be, he would be a bold man who would t
an immense number of places, — the railroads employ nea
900,000 persons, — many of them important and highly pa
into the lap of a party minister. Economic gain, assumi

the bestowal of free passes for passengers, a form of preference which
assumed large proportions.

[1] It would appear that the freight charges on American railways w
before 1887, generally lower than those in England and in Western Eur
generally. English third class passenger fares are slightly lower than th
in the ordinary American cars.

at such gain could be secured, would be dearly bought by olitical danger.

Their strife with the State governments has not been enough occupy the pugnacity of the companies. They must needs ght with one another; and their wars have been long and rce, involving immense pecuniary interests, not only to the areholders in the combatant lines, but also to the inhabitants the districts which they served. Such conflicts have been ost frequent between the trunk lines competing for the carage of goods from the West to the Atlantic cities, and have en conducted not only by lowering charges so as to starve t the weaker line,[1] but by attacks upon its stocks in the eat share markets, by efforts to defeat its bills in the State gislatures, and by law-suits with applications for injunctions the courts. Sometimes, as in the famous case of the struggle the Atchison Topeka and Santa Fé railway with the Denver d Rio Grande for the possession of the great cañon of the rkansas River,[2] the easiest route into an important group of ocky Mountain valleys, the navvies of the two companies ught with shovels and pickaxes on the spot, while their unsel were fighting in the law courts sixteen hundred miles ay. A well-established company has sometimes to appreend a peculiarly annoying form of attack at the hands of dacious adventurers, who construct a competing line where e traffic is only sufficient to enable the existing one to pay dividend on the capital it has expended, aiming, not at the eation of a profitable undertaking, but at levying blackmail one which exists, and obtaining an opportunity of manipuing bonds and stocks for their own benefit. In such a case e railway company in possession has its choice between two urses: it may allow the new enterprise to go on, then lower own rates, and so destroy all possibility of profits; or it ay buy up the rival line, perhaps at a heavy price. Sometnes it tries the first course long enough to beat down the

[1] In one of these contests, one railway having lowered its rates for cattle a figure below paying point, the manager of the other promptly bought up the cattle he could find at the inland terminus, and sent them to the coast the enemy's line, a costly lesson to the latter.

[2] This so-called "Royal Gorge" of the Arkansas is one of the most striking ces of scenery on the North American continent, not unlike the grandest rt of the famous Dariel Pass in the Caucasus.

already small prospects of the new line and then buys it; b
although this may ruin the "pirates" (as they are commor
called) who have built the new line, it involves a hideous wa
of the money spent in construction, and the shareholders of t
old company as well as the bondholders of the new one suff
This is a form of raid upon property which evidently ought
be prevented by a greater care on the part of State legislatu
in refusing to pass special Acts for unnecessary railroads, or
so modifying their law as to prevent a group of promoters fr
using, for purposes of blackmail, the powers of taking land a
constructing railroads, which general statutes confer.

This atmosphere of strife has had something to do with t
feature of railway management which a European finds m
remarkable; I mean its autocratic character. Nearly all t
great lines are controlled and managed either by a small knot
persons or by a single man. Sometimes one man, or a knot
three or four capitalists acting as one man, holds an actual maj
ity of the shares, and then he can of course do exactly what
pleases. Sometimes the interest of the ruling man (or kn
comes so near to being a controlling interest that he may saf
assume that no majority can be brought against him, the t
dencies of many shareholders being to support "the administ
tion" in all its policy. This accumulation of voting power
a few hands seems to be due partly to the fact that the sha
of new lines do not, in the first instance, get scattered throu
the general public as in England, but are commonly allot
in masses to a few persons, often as a sort of bonus upon th
subscribing for the bonds of the company.[1] In the Uni

[1] "It is an extraordinary fact," says Mr. Hitchcock, "that the powe
eminent domain which the State itself confessedly ought never to use sav
grounds of public necessity should be at the command of irresponsible indi
uals for purposes of private gain, not only without any guarantee that
public interest will be promoted thereby, but when it is perfectly well kn
that it may be, and has been, deliberately availed of for merely specula
purposes. The facility with which, under loosely drawn railroad laws, pu
speculative railroad charters can be obtained has contributed not a littl
develop the law of receiverships. In Missouri there is nothing to prevent
five men whose combined capital would not enable them to build five m
of track on a level prairie from forming a railroad corporation with powe
construct a road five hundred miles long, and to condemn private property
that purpose, for a line whose construction no public interest demands, and i
which no experienced man could expect dividends to accrue." — Addres
the American Bar Association, 1887.

tates shares do not usually represent a cash subscription, the ractice being to construct a railway with the proceeds of the nds and to regard the shares as the materials for future rofit, things which may, if the line be of a speculative charac- r, be run up in price and sold off by the promoters; or, if it e likely to prosper, be held by them for the purpose of con- olling as well as gaining profits from the undertaking.[1] It partly also to be ascribed to the splendid boldness with hich financial operations are conducted in America, where e leaders of Wall Street do not hesitate to buy up enormous asses of shares of stock for the purpose of some *coup*. Hav- g once got into a single hand, or a few hands, these stock asses stay there, and give their possessors the control of the ne. But the power of the railways, and the position they ld towards local governments, State legislatures, and one nother, have also a great deal to do with the phenomenon. ar is the natural state of an American railway towards all her authorities and its own fellows, just as war was the tural state of cities towards one another in the ancient rld. And as an army in the field must be commanded by e general, so must this latest militant product of an emi- ntly peaceful civilization. The president of a great railroad eds gifts for strategical combinations scarcely inferior to ose, if not of a great general, yet of a great war minister — Chatham or a Carnot. If his line extends into a new coun- y, he must be quick to seize the best routes, — the best ysically, because they will be cheaper to operate, the best agricultural or mineral resources, because they will offer a eater prospect of traffic. He must so throw out his branches not only to occupy promising tracts, but keep his competing emies at a distance; he must annex small lines when he s a good chance, first "bearing" their stocks so as to get them

[1] The great Central Pacific Railway was constructed by four men, two of om were when they began storekeepers in a small way in San Francisco, none of whom could be called capitalists. Their united funds when they an in 1860 were only $120,000 (£24,000). They went on issuing bonds and lding the line bit by bit as the bonds put them in funds, retaining the con- of the company through the shares. This Central Pacific Company ulti- ely built the Southern Pacific and numerous branches, and became by far greatest power in the West, owning nearly all the railways in California Nevada. When one of the four died in 1878, his estate was worth ,000,000 (£6,000,000).

cheaper; he must make a close alliance with at least one oth great line, which completes his communications with the E or with the farther West, and be prepared to join this ally a conflict with some threatening competitor. He must kn the Governors and watch the legislatures of the States Territories though which his line runs; must have adr agents at the State capitals, well supplied with the sinews war, ready to "see" leading legislators and to defeat any l islative attacks that may be made by blackmailers or the to of rival presidents. And all the while he must not only ke his eye upon the markets of New York, prepared for the slaught which may be made upon his own stock by some oth railroad or by speculators desiring to make a profit as "bear and maintaining friendly relations with the capitalists wh help he will need when he brings out a new loan, but m supervise the whole administrative system of the railroad its stations, permanent way, locomotives, rolling stock, en neering shops, freight and passenger rates, perhaps also sale of its land grants and their defence against the cabals Washington. No talents of the practical order can be high for such a position as this; and even the highest tale would fail to fill it properly except with a free hand. Conc tration of power and an almost uncontrolled discretion needed; and in America whatever commercial success ne is sure to be yielded. Hence, when a group of capitalists o a railway, they commit its management to a very small c mittee among themselves, or even to a single man; and wh the shares are more widely distributed, the shareholders, rec nizing the necessary conditions of prosperity, not to say survival in the struggle for existence, leave themselves in hands of the president, who has little to fear except from shares being quietly bought up by some syndicate of enem seeking to dethrone him.

Of these great railway chieftains, some come to the gradually, by the display in subordinate posts of brilli administrative gifts. Some begin as financiers, and spr into the presidential saddle at a bound by forming a c bination which captures the railway by buying up its st Occasionally a great capitalist will seize a railroad only the sake of manipulating its stock, clearing a profit,

rowing it away. But more frequently, when a really
portant line has passed into the hands of a man or group,
is held fast and developed into a higher efficiency by means
the capital he or they command.

These railway kings are among the greatest men, perhaps I
ay say are the greatest men, in America. They have wealth,
se they could not hold the position. They have fame, for
ery one has heard of their achievements; every newspaper
ronicles their movements. They have power, more power—
at is, more opportunity of making their personal will prevail
than perhaps any one in political life, except the President
d the Speaker, who after all hold theirs only for four years
d two years, while the railroad monarch may keep his for
e. When the master of one of the greatest Western lines
avels towards the Pacific on his palace car, his journey is
ke a royal progress. Governors of States and Territories
w before him; legislatures receive him in solemn session;
ties seek to propitiate him, for has he not the means of
aking or marring a city's fortunes? Although the railroad
mpanies are unpopular, and although this autocratic sway
om a distance contributes to their unpopularity, I do not
ink that the ruling magnates are themselves generally dis-
ted. On the contrary, they receive that tribute of admiration
hich the American gladly pays to whoever has done best
hat every one desires to do. Probably no career draws to it
unfolds and develops so much of the characteristic ability
the nation; and I doubt whether any congressional legis-
ion will greatly reduce the commanding positions which
ese potentates hold as the masters of enterprises whose
alth, geographical extension, and influence upon the growth
the country and the fortunes of individuals, find no parallel
the Old World.

It may be thought that some of the phenomena I have
scribed belong to an era of colonization, and that when the
est has been filled up, and all the arterial railways made,
en, in fact, the United States have become even as England
France, the power of railroads and their presidents will
cline. No doubt there will be less room for certain bold
ntures and feats of constructive strategy; and as the net-
rk of railways grows closer, States and districts may come

to depend less upon one particular company. At the sa time it must be remembered that the more populous a wealthy the country, so much the larger the business of trunk line, and the number of its branches and its employé while the consolidation of small lines, or their absorption large ones, is a process evidently destined to continue. It m therefore be conjectured that the railroad will long sta forth as a great and perplexing force in the economico-politi life of the United States. It cannot be left to itself — t most extreme advocate of *laissez faire* would not contend that, for to leave it to itself would be to make it a tyra It cannot be absorbed and worked by the National gove ment; — only the most sanguine state socialist would propo to impose so terrible a strain on the virtue of Americ politicians, and so seriously to disturb the constitutio balance between the States and the Federal authority. Ma experiments may be needed before the true mean cou between these extremes is discovered. Meanwhile, the r roads illustrate two tendencies specially conspicuous America, — the power of the principle of association, wh makes commercial corporations, skilfully handled, formida to individual men; and the way in which the principle monarchy, banished from the field of government, creeps b again and asserts its strength in the scarcely less momento contests of industry and finance.

CHAPTER CIV

WALL STREET

No invention of modern times, not even that of negotiable
per, has so changed the face of commerce and delighted law-
rs with a variety of new and intricate problems as the creation
incorporated joint-stock companies. America, though she
me latest into the field, has developed these on a grander
ale and with a more refined skill than the countries of the
d World. Nowhere do trading corporations play so great a
rt in trade and industry; nowhere are so many huge under-
kings in their hands; nowhere else has the method of con-
olling them become a political problem of the first magnitude.
vigorous, indeed, is the inventive genius of American com-
erce that, not satisfied with the new applications it has found
r the principles of the joint-stock corporation, it has lately
tempted a further development of the arts of combination
creating those anomalous giants called Trusts, groups of
lividuals and corporations concerned in one branch of trade
manufacture, which are placed under the irresponsible man-
ement of a small knot of persons, who, through their com-
and of all the main producing or distributing agencies,
end and expect to dominate the market, force manufac-
rers or dealers to submit, and hold the consumer at their
ercy.[1]

Here, however, I am concerned with the amazing expansion
joint-stock companies in America, only as the cause of the
t less amazing activity in buying and selling shares which
e people display. This is almost the first thing that strikes
European visitor, and the longer he remains the more deeply

[1] The question what is the legal status (if any) of these Trusts, the first of
ich was created in 1869, has been much discussed by American jurists.
hen Congress legislated against them in 1890 there existed at least thirty.

is he impressed by it as something to which his own count be it England, France, or Germany, furnishes no parallel. Europe, speculation in bonds, shares, and stocks is confined a section of the commercial world, with a few stragglers fr other walks of business, or from the professions, who flut near the flame and burn their wings. Ordinary steady-go people, even people in business, know little or nothing ab the matter, and seldom think of reading the share lists. Wh they have savings to invest they do as they are bidden their banker or stockbroker, if indeed they have a stockbrok and do not get their banker to engage one.[1] In the Uni States a much larger part of the population, including pro sional men as well as business men, seem conversant with subject, and there are times when the whole community, merely city people but also storekeepers in country towns, e farmers, even domestic servants, interest themselves actively share speculations. At such times they watch the fluctuati of price in the stocks of the great railroads, telegraph com nies (or rather the Telegraph Company, since one overshad all others), and other leading undertakings; they discuss prospects of a rise or fall, and the probable policy of the gr operators; they buy and sell bonds or stocks on a scale always commensurate with their own means.[2] In the gr cities the number of persons exclusively devoted to this oc pation is very large, and naturally so, because, while undertakings lie all over a vast extent of country, the cap which owns them is mostly situate in the cities, and, ind six-sevenths of it (so far as it is held in America) in four five of the greatest Eastern cities. It is chiefly in railro that these Easterns speculate. But in the Far West mi are an even more exciting and pervasive interest. In Francisco every one gambles in mining stocks, even the nu maids and the Chinese. The share lists showing the osc

[1] There are, of course, simple folk in England who take shares on the of prospectuses of new companies sent to them; but the fact that it pa send such prospectuses is the best proof of the general ignorance, in matters, of laymen (including the clergy) and women in that country.

[2] In many country towns there are small offices, commonly called "bu shops," to which farmers and tradesmen resort to effect their purchases sales in the great stock markets of New York. Not a few ruin themse Some States have endeavoured to extinguish them by penal legislation.

ns of prices are hung up outside the newspaper offices, and ed on posts in the streets, and are changed every hour or o during the day. In the silver districts of Colorado and w Mexico, the same kind of thing goes on.[1] It is naturally such spots that the fire burns hottest. But go where you l in the Union, except, to be sure, in the more stagnant and pecunious parts of the South, you feel bonds, stocks, and ares in the atmosphere all round you. *Te veniente die*— ey begin the day with the newspaper at breakfast: they end with the chat over the nocturnal cigar.[2]

This eager interest centres itself in New York, for finance, re perhaps than any other kind of business, draws to few nts, and New York, which has as little claim to be the social intellectual as to be the political capital of the country, is phatically its financial capital. And as the centre of nerica is New York, so the centre of New York is Wall reet. This famous thoroughfare is hardly a quarter of a le long, a little longer than Lombard Street in London. It ntains the Sub-Treasury of the United States and the Stock change. In it and the three or four streets that open into are situated the Produce Exchange, the offices of the great lways, and the places of business of the financiers and ckbrokers, together representing an accumulation of capital l intellect comparable to the capital and intellect of London, l destined before many years to surpass every similar spot either hemisphere.[3] Wall Street is the great nerve centre of American business; for finance and transportation, the two ermining powers in business, have here their headquarters. s also the financial barometer of the country, which every n engaged in large affairs must constantly consult, and

In a mining town in Colorado the landlady of an inn in which I stayed for ght pressed me to bring out in London a company to work a mining claim ch she had acquired, offering me what is called an option. I inquired how h money it would take to begin to work the claim and get out the ore. ss than thirty thousand dollars" (£6000). (The carbonates are in that of Colorado very near the surface.) "And what is to be the capital of company?" "Five millions of dollars" (£1,000,000)!

Of course I am speaking of the man you meet in travelling, who is a ple of the ordinary citizen. In polite society one's entertainer would no e bring up such a subject, unless you drew him on to do so, than he would k of talking politics.

The balances settled in the New York Clearing House each day are two- ls of all the clearings in the United States.

whose only fault is that it is too sensitive to slight and tr
sient variations of pressure.

The share market of New York, or rather of the wh
Union, in "the Street," as it is fondly named, is the m
remarkable sight in the country after Niagara and the Yell
stone Geysers. It is not unlike those geysers in the viole
of its explosions, and in the rapid rise and equally rapid s
sidence of its active paroxysms. And as the sparkling colu
of the geyser is girt about and often half concealed by
umes of steam, so are the rise and fall of stocks mostly
rounded by mists and clouds of rumour, some purpos
created, some self-generated in the atmosphere of exciteme
curiosity, credulity, and suspicion which the denizens of W
Street breathe. Opinions change from moment to mome
hope and fear are equally vehement and equally irration
men are constant only in inconstancy, superstitious beca
they are sceptical, distrustful of patent probabilities,
therefore ready to trust their own fancies or some unfathe
tale. As the eagerness and passion of New York leave E
pean stock markets far behind, for what the Paris and Lon
exchanges are at rare moments Wall Street is for weeks
perhaps, with a few intermissions, for months together, so
operations of Wall Street are vaster, more boldly concei
executed with a steadier precision, than those of Euro
speculators. It is not only their bearing on the prosperit
railroads or other great undertakings that is eagerly wat
all over the country, but also their personal and dram
aspects. The various careers and characters of the lea
operators are familiar to every one who reads a newspa
his schemes and exploits are followed as Europe follo
the fortunes of Prince Alexander of Battenberg or Gen
Boulanger. A great "corner," for instance, is one of
exciting events of the year, not merely to those conce
with the stock or species of produce in which it is attemp
but to the public at large.

How far is this state of things transitory, due to tempo
causes arising out of the swift material development of
United States? During the Civil War the creation of a p
currency, which rapidly depreciated, produced a wild spe
tion in gold, lasting for several years, whose slightest flu

ıs were followed with keen interest, because in indicating value of the paper currency they indicated the credit of nation, and the view taken by the financial community of prospects of the war. The re-establishment of peace ught with it a burst of industrial activity, specially directed he making of new railroads and general opening up of the st. Thus the eyes that had been accustomed to watch ll Street did not cease to watch it, for these new enter-ses involved many fortunes, had drawn much capital from ll investors, and were really of great consequence — the ıscontinental railways most of all — to the welfare of the ntry. It is some time since the work of railway construc-ı began to slacken, as it slackened in England a generation , although from time to time there is a revival. Mines less profitable since the great fall in silver; the price of ited States bonds fluctuates hardly (if at all) more than sols do in England. Times of commercial depression are ıparatively quiet, yet even when transactions are fewer, the erest of the public in the stock markets does not greatly inish. Trade and manufactures cover the whole horizon of erican life far more than they do anywhere in Europe. ey — I include agriculture, because it has been, in America, ımercialized, and become really a branch of trade — are the n concern of the country, to which all others are subordi-e. So large a part of the whole capital employed is in the ds of joint-stock companies,[1] so easy a method do these ıpanies furnish by which the smallest investor may take t in commercial ventures and increase his pile, so general he diffusion of information (of course often incorrect) arding their state and prospects, so vehement and per-ing is the passion for wealth, so seductive are the examples ı few men who have realized stupendous fortunes by clever nerely lucky hits when there came a sharp rise or fall in stock market, so vast, and therefore so impressive to the

[1] The wealth of corporations has been estimated by high authorities at one-th of the total value of all property in the United States. I find that in State of Illinois alone (population in 1890, 3,818,000) there were formed ng the year 1886, under the general law, 1714 incorporated companies, an aggregate capital stock (authorized) of $819,101,110. Of these, 632 manufacturing companies, 104 mining companies, 41 railroad compa-

imagination, is the scale on which these oscillations take pla
that the universal attention given to stocks and shares, and
tendency to speculation among the non-financial classes wh
reveals itself from time to time, seem amply accounted for
permanent causes, and therefore likely to prove normal. E
admitting that neither such stimulations as were present dur
the war period nor those that belonged to the era of infla
prosperity which followed are likely to recur, it must
observed that habits formed under transitory conditions
not always pass away with those conditions, but may beco
a permanent and, so to speak, hereditary element in natio
life.

So far as politics are concerned, I do not know that W
Street does any harm. There is hardly any speculation
foreign securities, because capital finds ample employment
domestic undertakings; and the United States are so little lik
to be involved in foreign complications that neither the act
of European powers nor that of the Federal government be
directly enough upon the stock markets to bring politics
stocks or stocks into politics.[2] Hence one source of evil wh
poisons public life in Europe, and is believed to have pro
specially pernicious in France — the influence of financial sp
lators or holders of foreign bonds upon the foreign policy
a government — is wholly absent. An American Secretar
State, supposing him base enough to use his official knowle
for stock-jobbing operations, would have little advantage
the meanest broker in Wall Street.[3] Even as regards dom
tic politics, the division of power between Congress and
State legislatures reduces the power of the former over in
trial undertakings, and leaves comparatively few occasion

[1] The great rebound of trade in 1879–83 trebled within those years the
of many railroad bonds and stocks, and raised at a still more rapid rat
value of lands in many parts of the West.

[2] Of course the prospects of war or peace in Europe do sensibly affec
American produce markets, and therefore the railroads, and indeed all
commercial undertakings. But these prospects are as much outside the
ince of the American statesman as the drought which affects the coming
or the blizzard that stops the earnings of a railway.

[3] The Secretary of the Treasury, by his control of the public debt, h
doubt means of affecting the markets; but I have never heard any cha
improper conduct in such matters on the part of any one connected wit
Treasury Department.

ich the action of the Federal government tends to affect the rket for most kinds of stocks, though of course changes in e public debt and in the currency affect by sympathy every rt of the machinery of commerce. The shares of railroad mpanies owning land grants were, and to some slight extent ll are, depressed and raised by the greater or slighter pros-cts of legislative interference; but it may be expected that s point of contact between speculators and politicians, ich, like the meeting-point of currents in the sea, is marked a good deal of rough and turbid water, will soon cease to ist, as the remaining railroad lands get sold or are declared feited.

The more serious question remains: How does Wall Street l on the character of the people? They are naturally inclined be speculative. The pursuit of wealth is nowhere so eager in America, the opportunities for acquiring it are nowhere numerous. Nowhere is one equally impressed by the ogress which the science and arts of gain — I do not mean e arts that add to the world's wealth, but those by which lividuals appropriate an exceptionally large share of it — ke from year to year. The materials with which the restor or the speculator has to work may receive no sensible dition; but the constant application of thousands of keen ellects, spurred by sharp desire, evolves new combinations t of these old materials, devises new methods and contriv-es apt for a bold and skilful hand, just as electricians go on rfecting the machinery of the telegraph, just as the accumu-ed labours of scholars present us with always more trust-rthy texts of the classical writers and more precise rules of eek and Latin syntax. Under these new methods of busi-ss, speculation, though it seems to become more of a science, es not become less speculative. People seem to buy and l on even slighter indications than in Paris or London. The ocesses of "bulling" and "bearing" are more constant and re skilfully applied. The whole theory and practice of nargins" has been more completely worked out. However, is of less consequence for our present purpose to dwell on e proficiency of the professional operator than to note the evalence of the habit of speculation: it is not intensity so ich as extension that affects an estimate of the people at large.

LIBRARY

Except in New York, and perhaps in Chicago, which is mo
and more coming to reproduce and surpass the characteristi
of New York, Americans bet less upon horse-races than t
English do. Horse-races are, indeed, far less common, thou
there is a good deal of fuss made about trotting-match
However, much money changes hands, especially in Easte
cities, over yacht-races, and plenty everywhere over election
The purchase and sale of "produce futures," *i.e.* of cotto
wheat, maize, bacon, lard, and other staples not yet in exi
ence but to be delivered at some distant day, has reach
an enormous development.[2] There is, even in the Easte
cities, where the value of land might be thought to have
come stable, a real estate market in which land and houses a
dealt in as matter for pure speculation, with no intention
holding except for a rise within the next few hours or da
while in the new West the price of lands, especially n
cities, undergoes fluctuations greater than those of the m
unstable stocks in the London market. It can hardly
doubted that the pre-existing tendency to encounter risks a
"back one's opinion," inborn in the Americans, and foste
by the circumstances of their country, is further stimulated
the existence of so vast a number of joint-stock enterpris
and by the facilities they offer to the smallest capitalis
Similar facilities exist in the Old World; but few of
inhabitants of the Old World have yet learned how to use a
abuse them. The Americans, quick at everything, have lear
long ago. The habit of speculation is now a part of th
character, and it increases that constitutional excitability a
high nervous tension of which they are proud.

Some may think that when the country fills up and sett
down, and finds itself altogether under conditions more nea
resembling those of the Old World, these peculiarities
fade away. I doubt it. They seem to have already pas
into the national fibre.

[1] The mischief has been thought sufficient to be specially checked by
constitutions or statutes of some States.

[2] It is stated that the Cotton Exchange sells in each year five times
value of the cotton crop, and that in 1887 the Petroleum Exchange sold
times the amount of that year's yield.

I have referred in a note to a preceding chapter to some recent attemp
check by legislation this form of speculation (p. 542, *ante*).

CHAPTER CV

THE UNIVERSITIES

Among the universities of America there is none which has rung up of itself like Bologna or Paris or El Azhar or Oxford, ne founded by an Emperor like Prague, or by a Pope like asgow. All have been the creatures of private munificence denominational zeal or State action. Their history is short leed compared with that of the universities of Europe. Yet is full of interest, for it shows a steady growth, it records ny experiments, it gives valuable data for comparing the ucational results of diverse systems.

When the first English colonists went to America, the large l liberal mediæval conception of a university, as a place ere graduates might teach freely and students live freely, s waxing feeble in Oxford and Cambridge. The instruction s given chiefly by the colleges, which had already become, at they long continued, organisms so strong as collectively eclipse the university they had been meant to aid. Accordly when places of superior instruction began to grow up in colonies, it was on the model not of an English university of an English college that they were created. The glory founding the first place of learning in the English parts of erica belongs to a Puritan minister and graduate of Camdge, John Harvard of Emmanuel College.[1] who, dying in 8, eighteen years after the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, e half his property for the establishment of a college in town of Cambridge, three miles from Boston, which, origily organized on the plan of Emmanuel College, and at once

[1] Emmanuel was a college then much frequented by the Puritans. Of the lish graduates who emigrated to New England between 1620 and 1647, ly one hundred in number, three-fourths came from the University of bridge.

taken under the protection of the infant commonwealth Massachusetts, has now grown into the most famous univers on the North American continent.[1]

The second foundation was due to the Colonial Assembly Virginia. So early as 1619, twelve years after the first sett ment at Jamestown, the Virginia Company in England vot ten thousand acres of land in the colony for the establishme of a seminary of learning, and a site was in 1624 actually apart, on an island in the Susquehanna River, for the "Fou inge and Maintenance of a University and such schools in V ginia as shall there be erected, and shall be called Academ Virginiensis et Oxoniensis." This scheme was never carri out. But in 1693 the Virginians obtained a grant of land a money from the home government for the erection of a colleg which received the name of the College of William and Mar The third foundation was Yale College, established in Conn ticut (first at Saybrook, then at New Haven) in 1700; t fourth Princeton, in New Jersey, in 1746. None of the received the title of university: Harvard is called a "scho or colledge": Yale used the name "collegiate school" for se enteen years. "We on purpose gave your academy as low name as we could that it might the better stand the wind a weather" was the reason assigned. Other academies or c

[1] In 1636 the General Court of the colony of Massachusetts Bay agreed " give Four Hundred Pounds towards a school or college, whereof Two Hund Pounds shall be paid the next year, and Two Hundred Pounds when the wo is finished, and the next Court to appoint where and what building." In 1 the General Court appointed a Commission of twelve "to take order for a c lege at Newtown." The name Newtown was presently changed to Cambrid John Harvard's bequest being worth more than twice the £400 voted, the na of Harvard College was given to the institution; and in 1642 a statute w passed for the ordering of the same.

[2] The Virginians had worked at this project for more than thirty ye before they got their charter and grant. "When William and Mary h agreed to allow £2000 out of the quit rents of Virginia towards building college, the Rev. Mr. Blair went to Seymour, the attorney-general, with royal command to issue a charter. Seymour demurred. The country w then engaged in war, and could ill afford to plant a college in Virginia. Blair urged that the institution was to prepare young men to become minist of the gospel. Virginians, he said, had souls to be saved as well as th English countrymen. 'Souls!' said Seymour. 'Damn your souls! Ma tobacco!'" — *The College of William and Mary*, by Dr. H. B. Adams. T oldest of Southern colleges was destroyed in the Civil War [1862] (it recently received a national grant of $64,000 as compensation), but w restored, and has been re-endowed by the legislature of Virginia in 18

eges in New England and the Middle States followed: such s that which is now the University of Pennsylvania, in 1749; King's, now Columbia, College in New York, in 1754; and Rhode Island College (now Brown University), in 1764; and ne habit of granting degrees grew up naturally and almost nperceptibly. A new departure is marked after the Revolu- on by the establishment, at the instance of Jefferson, of the niversity of Virginia, whose large and liberal lines gave it ore resemblance to the universities of the European conti- ent than to the then educationally narrow and socially domes- c colleges of England.

At present most of the American universities are referable one of two types, which may be described as the older and e newer, or the Private and the Public type. By the Old or rivate type I denote a college on the model of a college in xford or Cambridge, with a head called the President, and a umber of teachers, now generally called professors; a body of overnors or trustees in whom the property and general control the institution is vested; a prescribed course of instruction nich all students are expected to follow; buildings, usually lled dormitories, provided for the lodging of the students, d a more or less strict, but always pretty effective, discipline forced by the teaching staff. Such a college is usually of ivate foundation, and is almost always connected with some ligious denomination.

Under the term New or Public type I include universities tablished, endowed, and governed by a State, usually through body of persons called Regents. In such a university there mmonly exists considerable freedom of choice among various urses of study. The students, or at least the majority of em, reside where they please in the city, and are subject to ry little discipline. There are seldom or never denomina- nal affiliations, and the instruction is often gratuitous.

There are, however, institutions which it is hard to refer to e or other type. Some of these began as private foundations, th a collegiate and quasi-domestic character, but have now veloped into true universities, generally resembling those of rmany or Scotland. Harvard in Massachusetts and Yale in nnecticut are instances. Others have been founded by pri- e persons, but as fully equipped universities, and wholly

undenominational. Cornell at Ithaca in Western New Yo is an instance; Johns Hopkins in Baltimore is another of a d ferent order. Some have been founded by public authorit yet have been practically left to be controlled by a body self-renewing trustees. Columbia College in New York Ci is an instance. Still if we were to run through a list of t universities and colleges in the United States, we should fi that the great majority were either strictly private foundatio governed by trustees, or wholly public foundations governed the State. That is to say, the two familiar English types, v the University, which though a public institution is yet lit interfered with by the State, which is deemed to be compos of its graduates and students, and whose self-government co sists in its being governed by the graduates, and the Colleg which is a private corporation, consisting of a head, fellow and scholars, and governed by the head and fellows — neith of them appear in modern America. On the other hand, t American university of the Public type differs from the u versities of Germany in being placed under a State Board, n under a Minister. Neither in Germany nor in Scotland do find anything corresponding to the American university college of the Private type, for in neither of these countries a university governed by a body of self-renewing trustees.[1]

It is impossible within the limits of a chapter to do mo than state a few of the more salient characteristics of t American universities. I shall endeavour to present the characteristics in the fewest possible words, and for the sa of clearness shall group what I have to say under separa heads.

Statistics. — The report for 1889–90 of the United Stat Education Bureau gives the total number of universities a colleges, *i.e.* institutions granting degrees and professing give an instruction, higher than that of schools, in the libe arts, at 415, with 7918 professors or instructors, of whom 10 were women, and 118,581 students, of whom 39,415 are stat to be in the preparatory, 44,133 in the collegiate, 1998 in t

[1] The Scotch universities (since the Act of 1858), under their Univers Courts, and the Victoria University in the north of England present, howe a certain resemblance to the American system, inasmuch as the govern body is in these institutions not the teaching body.

duate, and 15,611 in the professional department. Of the al, 86,066 are stated to be men, 25,489 women, the rest being parently not distinguished in the returns.[1] Many of these titutions have professional departments for theology, law, medicine. But these figures are, to some extent, imperfect, ause a few institutions omit to send returns, and cannot be mpelled to do so, the Federal government having no author- in the matter. The number of degree-giving bodies, teach-, and students is therefore somewhat larger than is here ted, but how much larger it is not easy to ascertain. Be- es these there are returned —

chools of science	63	with	1182	teachers	13,017	students.
" theology	145	"	744	"	7,013	"
" law	54	"	346	"	4,518	"
" medicine[2]	228	"	3987	"	24,242[3]	"

ncluding dentistry and pharmacy)

e number of degrees conferred is returned as being, in ssical and scientific colleges, 9017, and in professional ools, 3296, besides 727 honorary degrees, 274 whereof are he degree of D.D.

General Character of the Universities and Colleges. — Out of s enormous total of degree-granting bodies very few answer he modern conception of a university. If we define a uni- sity as a place where teaching which puts a man abreast of fullest and most exact knowledge of the time, is given in a ge of subjects covering all the great departments of intel- ual life, not more than twelve and possibly only eight or e of the American institutions would fall within the defini- n. Of these nearly all are to be found in the Atlantic States. xt below them come some thirty or forty foundations which scarcely entitled to the name of university, some because r range of instruction is still limited to the traditional lit- y and scientific course such as it stood thirty years ago, ers because, while professing to teach a great variety of jects, they teach them in an imperfect way, having neither

[1] Institutions for women only are not included in this list.
[2] Of these 228, 14 institutions (with 268 teachers and 1164 students) are œopathic.
[3] Of these students 2458 were women.

a sufficiently large staff of highly trained professors, nor adequate provision of laboratories, libraries, and other exter appliances. The older New England colleges are good typ of the former group. Their instruction is sound and thorou as far as it goes, well calculated to fit a man for the professio of law or divinity, but it omits many branches of learning a science which have grown to importance within the last fi years. There are also some Western colleges which dese to be placed in the same category. Most of the Western St universities belong to the other group of this second cla that of institutions which aim at covering more ground th they are as yet able to cover. They have an ambitious p gramme; but neither the state of preparation of their studen nor the strength of the teaching staff, enables them to do j tice to the promise which the programme holds out. They true universities rather in aspiration than in fact.

Below these again there is a third and much larger class colleges, let us say three hundred, which are for most inte and purposes schools. They differ from the *gymnasia* of G many, the *lycées* of France, the grammar schools of Engla and high schools of Scotland not only in the fact that they g degrees to those who have satisfactorily passed through th prescribed course or courses, but in permitting greater perso freedom to the students than boys would be allowed in th countries. They are universities or colleges as respects so of their arrangements, but schools in respect of the educatio results attained. These three hundred may be further divid into two sub-classes, distinguished from one another partly their revenues, partly by the character of the population th serve, partly by the personal gifts of the president, as the he of the establishment is usually called, and of the teache Some seventy or eighty, though comparatively small, are stro by the zeal and capacity of their staff, and while not attem ing to teach everything, teach the subjects which they do und take with increasing thoroughness. The remainder would better to renounce the privilege of granting degrees and be c tent to do school work according to school methods. The W and South are covered with these small colleges. In Illinoi find 28 named in the Report of the United States Educat Bureau, in Missouri 27, in Tennessee 20. In Ohio 37 are

turned — and the number may possibly be larger — scarce any one of which deserves to be called a university. The most fully equipped would seem to be the State University at Columbus, with a faculty of 32 teachers; but of its students 165 are in the preparatory department, 221 in the collegiate department, only 13 in the graduate department. Oberlin and the Ohio Wesleyan University at Delaware (both denominational) have larger totals of students, and may be quite as efficient, but in these colleges also the majority of students are to be found in the preparatory department. On the other hand, Massachusetts with a wealth far exceeding that of Missouri, and a population not much less, has only nine universities or colleges.

The total number of students in Harvard is given as 2126, in Yale 1477, in the State University of Michigan 2158, in Columbia College, New York, 1671, in the University of Pennsylvania 1550, in Cornell 1329.

Revenues. — Nearly all, if not all, of the degree-granting bodies are endowed, the great majority by private founders, but a good many also by grants of land made by the State in which they stand, partly out of lands set apart for educational purposes by the Federal government. In most cases the lands have been sold and the proceeds invested. Many of the State universities of the West receive a grant from the State treasury, voted annually or biennially by the legislature, but a preferable plan, which several States have recently adopted, is to enact a permanent statute giving annually to the university some fraction of a mill ($\frac{1}{1000}$ of a dollar) out of every dollar of the total valuation of the State. This acts automatically, increasing the grant as the resources of the State increase. The greater universities are constantly being enriched by the gifts of private individuals, often their own graduates; but the complaint is heard that these gifts are too frequently appropriated to some specific purpose, instead of being added to the general funds of the university. Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Cornell, and Johns Hopkins are now all of them wealthy foundations, and the stream of munificence swells daily.[1] Before long

[1] Mr. Johns Hopkins gave £700,000 to the university he founded at Baltimore. Within the last few years a magnificent endowment has been given by Mr. Leland Stanford, Senator for California, to found a new university at Palo Alto in that State, and still more recently Mr. John D. Rockefeller has given a vast sum to the new university he has established in Chicago.

there will be universities in America with resources far s
passing those of any Scottish university, and approaching t
collective income of the university and all the colleges
Oxford or in Cambridge. In some States the real proper
and funds of universities are exempt from taxation.

Government. — As already remarked, no American universi
or college is, so far as I know, governed either by its gra
uates alone, like Oxford and Cambridge, or by its teachi
staff alone, like the Scotch universities before the Act of 18
The State universities are usually controlled and managed
a board, generally called the Regents, sometimes elected
the people of the State, sometimes appointed by the Govern
or the legislature. There are States with an enlightened po
ulation, or in which an able president has been able to gui
and influence the Regents or the legislature, in which th
plan has worked excellently, securing liberal appropriatio
and interesting the commonwealth in the welfare of the hig
est organ of its intellectual life. Such a State is Michiga
There are also States, such as California, in which the has
or unwisdom of the legislature seems for a time to ha
cramped the growth of the university.

All other universities and colleges are governed by boar
of governors or trustees, sometimes allowed to renew the
selves by co-optation, sometimes nominated by a religio
denomination or other external authority.[1] The preside
of the institution is often, but not always, an *ex officio* memb
of this board, to which the management of property and fin
cial interests belongs, while internal discipline and edu
tional arrangements are usually left to the academic staff.
visitor from Europe is struck by the prominence of the pre
dent in an American university or college, and the almo
monarchical position which he sometimes occupies towa
the professors as well as towards the students. Far m
authority seems to be vested in him, far more to turn up
his individual talents and character, than in the universit

[1] In Harvard the government is vested in a self-renewing body of se
persons called the Corporation, or technically, the President and Fellow
Harvard College, who have the charge of the property; and in a Board
Overseers, appointed formerly by the legislature, now by the graduates,
each year to serve for six years, with a general supervision of the educatio
system, educational details and discipline being left to the Faculty.

f Europe. Neither the German Pro-Rector, nor the Vice-Chancellor in Oxford and Cambridge, nor the Principal in a Scottish university, nor the Provost of Trinity College in Dublin, nor the head in one of the colleges in Oxford or Cambridge, is anything like so important a personage in respect of his office, whatever influence his individual gifts may ive him, as an American college president.[1] In this, as in not few other respects, America is less republican than England. Of late years there have been active movements to secure he representation of the graduates of each university or college upon its governing body; and it now frequently happens hat some of the trustees are elected by the alumni. Good esults follow, because the alumni are disposed to elect men ounger and more abreast of the times, than most of the persons whom the existing trustees co-opt.

The Teaching Staff. — The Faculty, as it is usually called, aries in numbers and efficiency according to the popularity f the university or college and its financial resources. The rgest staff mentioned in the tables of the Bureau of Education is that of Harvard, with 217 professors, instructors, and cturers; while Yale has 143, Columbia and the University f Pennsylvania each 180, Princeton 45, the University of Iichigan 96, Johns Hopkins 58. Cornell returns 104, but pparently not all of these are constantly occupied in teaching. In the colleges of the West and North-west the average umber of teachers is small, say twelve in the collegiate, five the preparatory department. It is larger in the State universities, but in some few of the Southern and ruder Western tates sinks to five or six in all, each of them taking two or ree subjects. I remember to have met in the Far West a college president — I will call him Mr. Johnson — who gave me a ng account of his young university, established by public

[1] The president of a college was formerly usually, and in denominational leges almost invariably, a clergyman, and generally lectured on mental l moral philosophy. (When a layman was chosen at Harvard in 1828 the rgy thought it an encroachment.) He is to-day much less likely to be in lers even in a denominational college. However, of the 37 Ohio colleges out 20 seem to have clerical presidents. The greater universities of the st (except Yale and Princeton), and the Western State universities are w usually ruled by laymen. Even Amherst, an old and strictly denominanal college, and two of the leading Methodist universities — De Pauw and North-western — have no longer clerical heads.

authority, and receiving some small grant from the legislatu
He was an active sanguine man, and in dilating on his pl
frequently referred to "the Faculty" as doing this or conte
plating that. At last I asked of how many professors
Faculty at present consisted. "Well," he answered, "just
present the Faculty is below its full strength, but it will s
be more numerous." "And at present?" I inquired. "
present it consists of Mrs. Johnson and myself."

The salaries paid to professors, although tending to ri
seem small compared with the general wealth of the coun
and the cost of living. The highest known to me are those
Columbia College, a few of which exceed $5000 (£1000)
year, and in the new university at Chicago, which has offe
some of $7000. I doubt if any others reach these figu
except those in the Harvard Law School, which are $50
Even in Yale, Johns Hopkins, and Cornell, most fall bel
$4000. Harvard now gives $4500 to its full professors.
few presidents receive $10,000, which is the salary of an as
ciate justice of the Supreme court; but over the country g
erally I should guess that a president rarely receives $40
often only $3000 or $2000, and the professors less in prop
tion. Under these conditions it may be found surprising t
so many able men are to be found on the teaching staff of
a few colleges as well as universities, and that in the grea
universities there are also many who have trained themsel
by a long and expensive education in Europe for their wo
The reason is to be found partly in the fondness for scie
and learning which has lately shown itself in America, a
which makes men of intellectual tastes prefer a life of lett
with poverty to success in business or at the bar, partly
regards the smaller Western colleges, to religious motiv
these colleges being largely officered by the clergy of the
nomination they belong to, especially by those who love stu
or find their talents better suited to the class-room than to
pulpit.

The professors seem to be always among the social aristocr
of the city in which they live, though usually unable, from
smallness of their incomes, to enjoy social life as the co
sponding class does in Scotland or even in England. The p
tion of president is often one of honour and influence:

niversity dignitaries in Great Britain are so well known to he public, or have their opinions quoted with so much respect, s the heads of the seven or eight leading universities of the Jnited States.

The Students. —It is the glory of the American universities, s of those of Scotland and Germany, to be freely accessible to ll classes of the people. In the Eastern States comparatively ew are the sons of working men, because parents can rarely ear the expense of a university course, or dispense with a boy's arnings after he reaches thirteen. But even in the East a good nany come from straitened homes, receiving assistance from ome richer neighbour or from charitable funds belonging to he college at which they may present themselves, while some, n days when the standard of instruction was lower, and women ere less generally employed as teachers, used to keep district chools for three months in winter. In the West, where there little distinction of classes though great disparity of wealth, o many institutions exact a merely nominal fee, or are so eady to receive without charge a promising student, that the nly difficulty in a young man's way is that of supporting him- elf during his college course: and this he frequently does by arning during one half the year what keeps him during the her half. Often he earns it by teaching school: —nearly all ne eminent men of the last forty years, including several Presi- ents of the United States, have taught school in some part f their earlier careers. Sometimes he works at a trade, as any a student has done in Scotland; and, as in Scotland, he all the more respected by his class-mates for it. The in- ruction which he gets in one of these Western colleges may ot carry him very far, but it opens a door through which men real power can pass into the professions, or even into the omain of learning and scientific research. In no country are e higher kinds of teaching more cheap or more accessible. here is a growing tendency for well-to-do parents to send their ns to one of the greater universities irrespective of the pro- ssion they contemplate for them, that is to say, purely for e sake of general culture, or of the social advantages which university course is thought to confer. The usual age at nich students enter one of the leading universities of the East as in England, from eighteen to nineteen, and the usual age

of graduation twenty-two to twenty-three,[1] the regular cou
covering four years. In the West many students come a
more advanced age, twenty-four or twenty-five, their ea
education having been neglected, so the average in West
colleges is higher than in the East. In Scotland boys of fo
teen and men of twenty-four used to sit side by side in uni
sity class-rooms, and compete on equal terms. The place
less note draw students from their immediate vicinity only
those of importance boys are sent from all parts of the Un
The University of Michigan has been a sort of metropoli
university for the North-western States. Harvard and Y
which used to draw only from the Atlantic States, now rec
students from the West, and even from the shores of the Pac
A student generally completes his four years' graduation cou
at the same institution, but there are some who leave a sm
college after one year to enter at a larger one. A man
has graduated in a college which has only an Arts or colleg
department, will often, in case he designs himself for law
medicine, resort to the law or medical school of a larger
versity, or even, if he means to devote himself to scienc
philology, will pursue what is called a "post-graduate cour
at some one of the greatest seats of learning. Thus it
happen, as in Germany, that a man has studied at three or
universities in succession.

Buildings and External Aspect. — Few of the buildings in
college or university are more than a century old,[2] and am
these there is none of an imposing character, or with mar
architectural merit. Many of the newer ones are hands
and well arranged, but I have heard it remarked that
much money is now being spent, at least in the West, u
showy buildings, possibly with the view of commanding at
tion. The ground plan is rarely or never that of a quadra
as in England and Scotland, not because it was desire
avoid monastic precedents, but because detached buildings
thought to be better adapted to the cold and snows of wi
At Harvard and Yale the brick dormitories (buildings in w
the students live) and class-rooms are scattered over a l

[1] President Eliot gives it for Harvard at 22 years and 7 months.

[2] I remember one in Yale of A.D. 1753, called South Middle, which wa
erated as the oldest building there.

pace of grass planted with ancient elms, and have a very leasing effect. Rochester, too, has a spacious and handsome *ampus*. But none of the universities frequented by men, nless it be the University of Wisconsin, has such an ample nd agreeable pleasure-ground surrounding it as those possessed y the two oldest women's colleges, Vassar and Wellesley.

Time spent in Study. — Vacations are shorter than in Eng- nd or Scotland. That of summer usually lasts from the iddle of June to the middle of September, and there are gen- ally ten days or more given at Christmas and at least a week April. Work begins earlier in the morning than in Eng- nd, but seldom so early as in Germany. Very few students eem to work as hard as the men reading for high honours do Cambridge in England.

Local Distribution of Universities and Colleges. — The number degree-granting bodies seems to be larger in the Middle and orth-western States than either in New England or in the outh. In the tables of the Bureau of Education I find New ork, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, credited with 135, ery nearly one-third of the total for the United States; but many are small and indifferent, the mere number does not ecessarily speak of an ample and solid provision of education. ndeed Ohio and Illinois, with a population of about seven illions, have only one institution (the new university at hicago) eminent either by its wealth or the type of instruction offers. The thirteen Southern States (excluding Missouri, aryland, and Delaware) stand in the tables as possessing 4, but no one of these, except the University of Virginia, tains the first rank; and the great majority are under- anned and hampered by the imperfect preparation of the udents whom they receive.[1] In this respect, and as regards ucation generally, the South, though advancing, is still far hind the other sections of the country. There are several lleges, all or nearly all of them denominational, established r coloured people only.

System and Methods of Instruction. — Thirty years ago it ould have been comparatively easy to describe these, for

[1] It is hoped that the recently founded Tulane University in New Orleans ll eventually make its way to the front rank. It has an endowment of out $2,000,000 (£400,000).

nearly all the universities and colleges prescribed a reg four years' curriculum to a student, chiefly consisting of clas and mathematics, and leading up to a B.A. degree. A yo had little or no option what he would study, for everyb was expected to take certain classes in each year, and recei his degree upon having satisfactorily performed what wa each class required of him.[1] The course was not unlike followed (till 1892) in the Scottish universities: it began v Latin, Greek, and mathematics, and wound up with lo mental and moral philosophy, and a tincture of physics. struction was mainly, indeed in the small colleges who catechetical. Nowadays the simple uniformity of this tr tional system has vanished in the leading universities of Eastern and Middle States, and in nearly all the State versities of the West. There are still regular classes, a tain number of which every student must attend, but h allowed to choose for himself between a variety of course curricula, by following any one of which he may obtai degree. The freedom of choice is greater in some universi less in others; in some, choice is permitted from the firs most, however (including the great University of Yale), after two years. In Harvard freedom seems to have reac its maximum. This so-called elective system has been an the subject of a warm controversy, which has raged ch round the question whether Greek shall be a compulsory ject. The change was introduced for the sake of brin scientific subjects into the curriculum and enabling me specialize in them and in matters like history and Orienta Romance philology, and was indeed a necessary concomi to such a broadening of universities as may enable the keep pace with the swift development of new branche study and research during the last forty years. It is defe both on this ground and as being more likely than the strictly limited courses to give every student something w will interest him. It is opposed as tending to bewilder to disperse and scatter his mind over a too wide range of jects, perhaps unconnected with one another, to tempt with the offer of an unchartered freedom which he wants

[1] The University of Virginia was an exception, having received fro enlightened views of Jefferson an impulse towards greater freedom.

xperience to use wisely. One or two conspicuous universities, - Princeton, for example, — and many smaller colleges, have ung to the old system of one or two prescribed degree courses which comparatively little variation is admitted.[1] An elec- ve system is indeed possible only where the teaching staff is rge enough to do justice to a wide range of subjects.

A parallel change has passed upon the methods of teaching. ecturing with few or no questions to the class interposed is ecoming the rule in the larger universities, those especially hich adopt the elective system, while what are called "reci- tions," that is to say, catechetical methods resembling those Scotland or of a college (not university) lecture in Oxford irty years ago, remain the rule in the more conservative ajority of institutions, and are practically universal in West- n colleges. Some of the Eastern universities have recently tablished a system of informal instruction by the professor a small group of students on the model of the German eminar. Private "coaching," such as prevailed largely in xford and still prevails in Cambridge, is almost unknown.

Requirements for Entrance. — All the better universities and lleges exact a minimum of knowledge from those who matri- late. Some do this by imposing an entrance examination. thers allow certain schools, of whose excellence they are tisfied, to issue leaving certificates, the production of which titles the bearer to be admitted without examination. This an is said to work well.[2] Michigan seems to have led the ay in establishing a judiciously regulated and systematized lation between the public schools and the State university, d the University of California has now an excellent system

[1] The small colleges are the more unwilling to drop Greek as a compulsory bject because they think that by doing so they would lose the anchor by ich they hold to the higher culture, and confess themselves to be no longer iversities.

[2] At Harvard I was informed that about one-third of the students came m the public (*i.e.* publicly supported) schools. The proportion is in most iversities larger. There is a growing tendency in America, especially in East, for boys of the richer class to be sent to private schools, and the cellence of such schools increases. The total number of endowed acade- es, seminaries, and other private secondary schools over the country in 9–90 is returned as 1632, with 16,649 pupils (11,220 boys and 5429 girls) paring for a college classical course; 9649 pupils (6326 boys and 3323 girls) paring for a scientific course. But these figures are, of course, far from mplete.

for inspecting schools and admitting students on the basis school certificates.

Degrees and Examinations. — It is only institutions wh have been chartered by State authority that are deemed entit to grant degrees. There are others which do so without such legal title, but as the value of a degree *per se* is slig the mischief done by these interlopers can hardly be seric B.A., M.A., D.D., and LL.D., the two latter usually for honor purposes,[1] are the only degrees conferred in the great majo of colleges; but of late years the larger universities have creating new courses, created a variety of new degrees al Degrees are awarded by examination, but never, I think, often in Europe, upon a single examination held after course of study has been completed. The student, as he g through the various classes which make up his course, is amined, sometimes at frequent intervals, sometimes at the of each year, on the work done in the classes or on prescri books, and the degree is ultimately awarded or refused on combined result of all these tests. At no point in his ca is he expected to submit to any one examination compara for the combined number and difficulty of the subjects which he is questioned, to the final honour examinations Oxford or Cambridge, even as now constituted, much as they stood fifty years ago.

There is indeed no respect in which the American syste more contrasted with that of Oxford and Cambridge than comparatively small part assigned to the award of honours. England the Class list or Tripos has for many years past, since the universities awoke from their lethargy of last tury, been the main motive power in stimulating undergra ates to exertion and in stemming the current which runs strongly towards amusement and athletic exercises. Ex inations have governed teaching instead of being used to

[1] Honorary degrees are in some institutions, and not usually those o highest standing, conferred with a profuseness which seems to argue an gerated appreciation of inconspicuous merit.

[2] Mr. D. C. Gilman (President of Johns Hopkins University) mention following among the degree titles awarded in some institutions to women titles of Bachelor and Master being deemed inappropriate, — Laureate of ence, Proficient in Music, Maid of Philosophy, Mistress of Polite Litera Mistress of Musi (*North American Review* for March, 1885).

. In the United States, although most universities and col-
ges reward with some sort of honourable mention the students
ho have acquitted themselves conspicuously well, graduation
nours are not a great object of ambition; they win little
me within the institution, they are scarcely noticed beyond
s walls. In many universities there is not even the stimulus,
hich acts powerfully in Scotland, of class prizes, awarded by
xamination or by the votes of the students. It is only a few
stitutions that possess scholarships awarded by competition.
merican teachers seem to find the discipline of their regular
ass system sufficient to maintain a reasonable level of dili-
nce among their students, being doubtless aided by the fact
at, in all but a very few universities, the vast majority of the
udents come from simple homes, possess scanty means, and
ve their way in life to make. Diligence is the tradition of
e American colleges, especially of those remote from the
ssipating influences and social demands of large cities.
ven the greater universities have never been, as the English
iversities avowedly were in last century, and to a great
tent are still, primarily places for spending three or four
easant years, only incidentally places of instruction. With
me drawbacks, this feature of the American seminaries has
o notable merits. One is that it escapes that separation
hich has grown up in Oxford and Cambridge between pass or
ll men and honour men. Every student supposes himself to
ve come to college for the purpose of learning something.
all countries, even in Switzerland and Scotland, there is a
rcentage of idle men in places of study; but the idleness of
American student is due to something in his own character
circumstances, and does not, as in the case of the English
oll-man," rest on a theory in his own mind, probably shared
his parents, that he entered the university in order to enjoy
nself and form useful social connections. The other merit is
at the love of knowledge and truth is not, among the better
nds, vulgarized by being made the slave of competition and
the passion for quick and conspicuous success. An Ameri-
n student is not induced by his university to think less of
e intrinsic value of what he is learning than of how far it
ll pay in an examination: nor does he regard his ablest
low-students as his rivals over a difficult course for high

stakes, rivals whose speed and strength he must constantly comparing with his own. Americans who have studied in English university after graduating in one of their own have t me that nothing surprised them more in England than incessant canvassing of one another's intellectual capacit which went on among the clever undergraduates.[1] Proba less work is got out of the better American students than examination system exacts from the same class of men in ford and Cambridge. Possibly the qualities of readiness accuracy are not so thoroughly trained. Possibly it is a l not to be compelled to carry for a few weeks a large mass facts in one's mind under the obligation of finding any one a moment's notice. Those who direct the leading American u versities recognize in these points the advantages of Engl practice. But they conceive that the corresponding disadv tages are much greater, and are in this matter more incli to commiserate Oxford and Cambridge than to imitate them

Nearly all American students do graduate, that is to say those who would be likely to fail drop off before the close of fourth year, the proportion of plucks in the later examinati is small. As regards the worth of the degrees given, ther of course the greatest possible difference between those of better and those of the lower institutions, nor is this differe merely one between the few great universities and the mas small colleges or Western State universities, for among smaller colleges there are some which maintain as hig standard of thoroughness as the greatest. The degrees of two hundred colleges to which I have referred as belonging the lower group of the third class have no assignable va except that of indicating that a youth has been made to w during four years at subjects above the elementary. Thos institutions belonging to the higher group and the two ot classes represent, on an average, as much knowledge and n tal discipline as the poll or pass degrees of Cambridge Oxford, possibly less than the pass degrees of the Scot universities. Between the highest American degrees and honour degrees of Oxford and Cambridge it is hard to m any comparison.

[1] If this be true of England, the evil is probably no smaller under the prize system of Scotland.

A degree is in the United States given only to those who ave followed a prescribed course in the teaching institution vhich confers it. No American institution has so far departed rom the old and true conception of a university, approved by oth history and policy, as to become a mere examining board, warding degrees to anybody who may present himself from any uarter. However, the evils of existing arrangements, under vhich places below the level of German *gymnasia* are permitted o grant academic titles, are deemed so serious by some educa- ional reformers that it has been proposed to create in each tate a single degree-conferring authority to which the various nstitutions within the State should be, so to speak, tributary, ending up their students to its examinations, which would of ourse be kept at a higher level than most of the present in- ependent bodies maintain. This is what physicians call a heroic remedy"; and with all respect to the high authorities vho now advocate it, I hope they will reconsider the problem, nd content themselves with methods of reform less likely to ramp the freedom of university teaching.

Notwithstanding these evils, and the vast distance between he standard of a university like Johns Hopkins at the one end f the scale, and that of the colleges of Arkansas at the other, a egree, wherever obtained, seems to have a certain social value. It is," said one of my informants, "a thing which you would ention regarding a young man for whom you were writing a tter of introduction." This does not mean very much, but it better than nothing; it would appear to give a man some ort of advantage in seeking for educational or literary work. n several States a man who can point to his degree obtains peedier entrance to the bar, and some denominations endeavour o secure that their clergy shall have graduated.

Post-graduate Courses. — Several of the leading universities ave lately instituted sets of lectures for students who have mpleted the regular four years' collegiate course and taken eir B.A. or B.Sc., hoping in this way to provide for the pecial study of subjects for which room cannot be found in ie regular course. Johns Hopkins University was among ie first to devote itself especially to this object. Its aim as not so much to rival the existing universities as to dis- harge a function which many of them had not the means of

undertaking — that of providing the highest special instr tion, not necessarily in every subject, but in subjects which could secure the ablest professors to teach. It has alrea done much admirable work in this direction, and made go its claim to a place in the front rank of transatlantic seats education. There are also many graduates who, desiring devote themselves to some particular branch of science learning, such as experimental physics, philology, or histo spend a semester or two at a German university. Extreme few come to Oxford or Cambridge. American professors, wh asked why they send their men exclusively to Germany, c sidering that in England they would have the advantage o more interesting social life, and of seeing how England is t ing to deal with problems similar in many respects to th own, answer that the English universities make no provisi for any students except those who wish to go through one the regular degree courses, and are so much occupied in p paring men to pass examinations as to give, except in two three branches, but little advanced teaching. There can be doubt that if Oxford and Cambridge offered the advanta which Leipzig and Berlin do, the afflux to the two former American graduates would soon be considerable.

Professional and Scientific Schools. — Besides the very la number of schools for all the practical arts, agriculture, en neering, mining, and so forth, as well as for the professions theology, law, and medicine, statistics of which have be already given, some universities have established scient schools, or agricultural schools, or theological, legal, and me cal faculties. The theological faculties are usually denomi tional; but Harvard, which used to be practically Unitari has now an unsectarian faculty, in which there are seve learned divines belonging to Trinitarian denominations; a no difficulty seems to have arisen in working this arrangeme The law school is usually treated as a separate department, which students may resort who have not graduated in the u versity. The course is usually of two, sometimes of th years, and covers all the leading branches of common l equity, crimes, civil and criminal procedure. Many of th schools are extremely efficient.

Research. — Till recently no special provision was made

ıe promotion of research as apart from the work of learning ıd teaching; but the example set by Johns Hopkins and Iarvard in founding fellowships for this purpose has now ₹en pretty largely followed, and in 1889–90 there were in 5 institutions no less than 172 fellowships,[1] and the unceasing unificence of private benefactors may be expected to con-nue to supply the necessary funds. There is now, especially the greater universities, a good deal of specialization in aching, so an increasing number of professors are able to ₹cupy themselves with research.

Aids to Deserving Students. — Extremely few colleges have holarships or bursaries open to competition like those of the lleges in Oxford and Cambridge and of the Scottish univer-ties, still fewer have fellowships. But in a large number ere exist funds, generally placed at the disposal of the Presi-nt or the Faculty, which are applicable for the benefit of dustrious men who need help; and it is common to remit es in the case of those whose circumstances warrant the dulgence. When, as occasionally happens, free places or ants out of these funds are awarded upon examination, it ould be thought improper for any one to compete whose cir-mstances placed him above the need of pecuniary aid: when e selection is left to the college authorities, they are said discharge it with honourable impartiality. Having often ked whether favouritism was complained of, I could never ar that it was. In some colleges there exists a loan fund, t of which money is advanced to the poor student, who ₹erwards repays it. President Garfield obtained his educa-n at Williams College by the help of such a fund. The nominations often give assistance to promising youths who ₹end to enter the ministry. Says one of my most experi-₹ed informants: "In our country any young fellow of ability d energy can get education without paying for it."[2] The

[1] Of these Harvard and Columbia had 24 each, Johns Hopkins 21, Yale 6, nceton 12, the University of Pennsylvania and Cornell 8 each, Vanderbilt iversity (in Tennessee) 10, the University of Wisconsin 10.

[2] Fees, in the West especially, are low, indeed many Western State uni-sities require none. In the University of Michigan a student belonging to State pays $10 on admission and an annual fee of $20 (Literary Depart-ıt), or $25 (other departments), students from without the State paying (admission), $30 (Literary Department), $35 (other departments).

experiment tried at Cornell University in the way of pro
ing remunerative labour for poor students who were at
same time to follow a course of instruction, seems to h
proved unworkable, for the double effort imposes too sev
a strain.

Social Life of the Students. — Those who feel that not o
the keenest pleasure, but the most solid moral and intellect
benefit of their university life lay in the friendships wh
they formed in that happy spring-time, will ask how in
respect America compares with England. Oxford and C
bridge, with their historic colleges maintaining a corporate
from century to century, bringing the teachers into easy
friendly relations with the taught, forming between the m
bers of each society a close and almost family tie which is
incompatible with loyalty to the great corporation for wh
sake all the minor corporations exist, have succeeded in
ducing a more polished, graceful, and I think also intell
ually stimulative, type of student life than either Germa
with its somewhat boyish frolics of duelling and compotati
or Scotland, where the youth has few facilities for social in
course with his classmates, and none with his professor.
American universities occupy an intermediate position betw
those of England and those of Germany or Scotland. Form
all or nearly all the students were lodged in buildings ca
dormitories — which, however, were not merely sleeping pla
but contained sitting-rooms jointly tenanted by two or m
students — and meals were taken in common. This is
the practice in the smaller colleges, and remains firmly roo
in Yale, Harvard, and Princeton. In the new State uni
sities, and in nearly all universities planted in large cities,
great bulk of the students board with private families,
(more rarely) live in lodgings or hotels, and an increas
number have begun to do so even in places which, like H
vard and Brown University (Rhode Island) and Cornell, h
some dormitories. The dormitory plan works well in comp
tively small establishments, especially when, as is the
with the smaller denominational colleges, they are almost
large families, and are permeated by a religious spirit.
in the larger universities the tendency is now towards let
the students reside where they please. The maintenanc

iscipline is deemed to give less trouble; the poorer student s less inclined to imitate or envy the luxurious habits of the ich. Sometimes, however, as where there is no town for tudents to lodge in, dormitories are indispensable. The chief reaches of order which the authorities have to deal with rise in dormitories from the practice of "hazing," *i.e.* playing ractical jokes, especially upon freshmen. In an American ollege the students are classed by years, those of the first ear being called freshmen, of the second year sophomores, of he third year juniors, of the fourth year seniors. The bond etween the members of each "class" (*i.e.* the entrants of he same year) is a pretty close one, and they are apt to ct together. Between sophomores and freshmen — for the eniors and juniors are supposed to have put away childish hings — there is a smouldering jealousy which sometimes reaks out into a strife sufficiently acute, though there is sel- om anything more than mischievously high spirits behind it, o give the President and Faculty trouble.[1] Otherwise the con- uct of the students is generally good. Intoxication, gaming, r other vices are rare, those who come to work, as the vast ajority do, being little prone to such faults; it is only in a ew universities situate in or near large cities and resorted to y the sons of the rich that they give serious trouble. Of late ears the passion for base-ball, foot-ball, rowing, and athletic xercises generally, has become very strong in the universities st mentioned, where fashionable youth congregates, and the udent who excels in these seems to be as much a hero among is comrades as a member of the University Eight or Eleven in England. The excessive amount of time devoted to com- etition in these sports, especially as regards foot-ball, and the ordinate value set upon eminence in them, have in some niversities begun to cause disquiet to the authorities.

The absence of colleges constituting social centres within a niversity has helped to develop in the American universities ne of their most peculiar and interesting institutions — I mean e Greek letter societies. These are clubs or fraternities of

[1] Sophomores and freshmen have a whimsical habit of meeting one another dense masses and trying which can push the other aside on the stairs or th. This is called "rushing." In some universities the admission of women students has put an end to it.

students, denoted by two or three Greek letters, the initial
the secret fraternity motto. Some of these fraternities exis
one college only, but the greater are established in a good m
universities and colleges, having in each what is calle
Chapter, and possessing in each a sort of club house, v
several meeting and reading rooms, and sometimes also v
bedrooms for the members. In some colleges as many a
third or a half, in a very few nearly all of the students, bel
to a fraternity, which is an institution recognized and pa
nized by the authorities. New members are admitted by
votes of the Chapter; and to obtain early admission to on
the best is no small compliment. They are, so far as I kn
always non-political, though political questions may be deb
and political essays read at their meetings; and one is
that they allow no intoxicants to be kept in their building
used at the feasts they provide. They are thus something
tween an English club and a German *Studenten Corps*, but
the element of the literary or "mutual improvement" soc
thrown in. They are deemed a valuable part of the univer
system, not so much because they cultivate intellectual lif
on account of their social influence. It is an object of a
tion to be elected a member; it is a point of honour f
member to maintain the credit of the fraternity. For
members, who are likely to include some of the university
fessors, keep up their connection with the fraternity, and o
attend its chapters in the college, or its general meeti
Membership constitutes a bond between old members du
their whole life, so that a member on settling in some dis
city would probably find there persons who had belonged to
fraternity, and would be admitted to their local gatherin
Besides these there exist a few honorary societies into wh
students are elected in virtue of purely literary or scien
acquirements, as evidenced in the college examinations.
oldest and most famous is called the Φ B K, which is sai
mean *φιλοσοφία βίου κυβερνήτης*, and exists in nearly all the l
ing universities in most of the States.

[1] There are, of course, other students' societies besides these Greek
ones, and in some universities the Greek letter societies have become p
social rather than literary. One of them is regarded with much suspici
the authorities.

Religion. — I have already observed that most of the Amerian universities, and indeed a large majority of the smaller colleges, are denominational. This term, however, does not mean what it would mean in Europe, or at least in England. It means that they have been founded by or in connection with particular church, and that they remain to some extent associated with it or influenced by it. Only 99 out of the 415 mentioned in the Education Report state that they are unsectarian. The Methodists claim 74 colleges; the Presbyterians, 9; the Baptists, 44; the Roman Catholics, 51; the Congregationalists, 22; the Protestant Episcopalians, 6. But, except as regards the Roman Catholic institutions, there is seldom any exclusion of teachers, and never of students, belonging to other churches, nor any attempt to give the instruction (except, of course, in the theological department, if there be one) a sectarian cast; this indeed is apt to be expressly repudiated by them. Although it usually happens that students belonging to the church which influences the college are more numerous than those of any other church, students of other persuasions abound; nor are efforts made to proselytize them. For instance, Harvard retains a certain slight flavour of Unitarianism, and has one or two Unitarian clergymen among the professors in its theological faculty; Yale has always been Congregationalist, and has by its charter ten Congregationalist clergymen among its trustees; and moreover has always a Congregationalist clergyman as its president, as Brown University has a Baptist clergyman.[1] Princeton is still more specifically Presbyterian, and the Episcopalians have several denominational colleges in which the local bishop is one of the trustees. But in none of these is there anything approaching to a test imposed upon professors; all are resorted to alike by students belonging to any church or to none.

In all the older universities, and in the vast majority of the more recent ones, there is a chapel in which religious services are regularly held, short prayers on week-days and sometimes also a full service on Sundays. In most institu-

[1] Brown University, formerly called Rhode Island College (founded in 64), is in the rather peculiar position of having by its regulation four denominations, Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and Quakers, presented on its two governing bodies, the trustees and the fellows, the Baptists having a majority.

tions every student, unless of course he has some conscientio objection, is expected to attend. The service seldom or ne contains anything of a sectarian character, and arrangeme are sometimes made for having it conducted by the clergy various denominations in turn. Even among the professe neutral new State universities, there are some which, like University of Michigan, have daily prayers. There are course persons who think that an unsectarian place of edu tion cannot be a truly Christian place of education, and Cor University in its early days had to face attacks directed agai it on this score.[1] But the more prevalent view is that a u versity ought to be in a general sense religious without be sectarian.[2] An interesting experiment in unsectarian religi worship has for some time past been tried at Harvard. Atte ance at the college chapel, formerly compulsory, is now vol tary, and short morning daily services with extempore pray are conducted by the chaplains, who are eminent ministers different denominations, serving in turn for a few weeks ea The late Dr. Phillips Brooks was one of them; and his sh addresses profoundly impressed the students. About one-th of the total number of undergraduates usually attend.

The Provision of University Education for Women. — T efforts made and experiments tried in this matter furnish

[1] At Cornell University there exists a Sunday preachership endowed w fund of $30,000 (£6000), which is used to recompense the services of di guished ministers of different denominations, who preach in succession du twenty-one Sundays of the academic year. The founder was an Episcopa whose first idea was to have a chaplaincy limited to ministers of his den nation, but the trustees refused the endowment on such terms. The only dents who absent themselves are Roman Catholics.

[2] This idea is exactly expressed in the regulations for the recent great f dation of Mr. Leland Stanford in California. It is declared to be the du the trustees "to prohibit sectarian instruction, but to have taught in the versity the immortality of the soul, the existence of an all-wise and benev Creator, and that obedience to His laws is the highest duty of man." founders further declare, "While it is our desire that there shall be no s rian teaching in this institution, it is very far from our thoughts to ex divine service. We have provided that a suitable building be erected, wh the professors of the various religious denominations shall from time to be invited to deliver discourses not sectarian in character." On the hand, the still more recent foundation of Mr. Rockefeller at Chicago scribes that "at all times two-thirds of the trustees and also the preside the university and of its said college shall be members of regular Ba churches — and in this particular the charter shall be for ever unaltera All professorships, however, are to be free from any religious tests.

erial for a treatise. All I have space to mention is that these fforts have chiefly flowed in two channels. One is the admis-ion of women to co-education with men in the same places of igher education. This has gone on for many years in some f the denominational colleges of the West, such as Oberlin nd Antioch, in Ohio. Both sexes have been taught in the ame classes, meeting in the hours of recreation, but lodged in eparate buildings. My informants all commended the plan, eclaring that the effect on the manners and general tone of ne students was excellent. The State universities founded f late years in the West are by law open to women as well s to men. The number of women attending is always smaller nan that of men, yet in some institutions it is considerable, s for instance at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor nere were, in 1889–90, 369 women and 1789 men, and in the niversity of Minnesota, 232 women and 770 men, while berlin had 901 women and 812 men. The students live where ney will, but are taught in the same classes, generally, however, tting on the opposite side of the class room from the men. he evidence given to me as to the working of this system in ne Universities of California and Michigan, as well as in Cornell niversity, was favourable, save that the young men sometimes nd the competition of the girls rather severe, and call them study machines," observing that they are more eager, and ss addicted to sports or to mere lounging.

In the Eastern States the tendency has been to establish niversities or colleges exclusively for women, and cases are nown to me in which institutions that received both sexes nded by having a distinct department or separate college for omen. There are persons even in the East who would prefer ne scheme of co-education, but the more general view is that ne stricter etiquette and what is called the "more complex vilization" of the older States render this undesirable.[1] The tal number of colleges specially for women is given in the ducation Report for 1889–90 at 179, with 577 male and 1648 male instructors, and 24,851 students, of whom 11,811 were the "collegiate department." Most of these colleges, how-

[1] As the late Mr. George William Curtis wrote three years ago: "It is now ttled that Juliet may study, but shall she study with Romeo? — that is a estion which gives even Boston pause."

ever, might more fitly be described as upper schools. T number of degrees conferred was 978. Among these colleg the best known, and apparently the most complete and e cient,[1] are Vassar, at Poughkeepsie, New York; Wellesley a Smith in Massachusetts; Bryn Mawr in Pennsylvania. I v ited the two former, and was much impressed by the earne ness and zeal for learning by which both the professors a the students seemed to be inspired, as well as by the hi level of the teaching given. They have happily escaped t temptation to which some similar institutions in England se to yield, of making everything turn upon degree examinatio Harvard has established, in what was called its Annex, but now more generally known as Radcliffe College, a separa department for women, in which the university profess lecture. I have no adequate data for comparing the qual of the education given to women in America with that p vided by women's colleges, and especially by Girton a Newnham, in England, but there can be no doubt that t eagerness to make full provision for women has been kee in the former country, and that a much larger number av themselves of what has been provided.

General Observations. — The European reader will by t time have perceived how hard it is to give such a general es mate of the educational and social worth of the higher tea ing in the United States as one might give of the universit of Germany, England, and Scotland. In America the univ sities are not, as they are in those countries, a well-defi class of institutions. Not only is the distance between t best and the worst greater than that which in Germany se rates Leipzig from Rostock, or in England Cambridge fr Durham, but the gradations from the best down to the wo are so imperceptible that one can nowhere draw a line and s that here the true university stops and the pretentious sch begins.[2] As has been observed already, a large number pres

[1] In 1889-90 Wellesley had 660 students, with 79 professors and teachers women and 7 men), and $175,000 of productive funds. Smith College had students, 32 instructors (18 women and 14 men), and $422,739 of produc funds. Vassar had 325 students, 35 instructors (27 women and 8 men), $574,332 of productive funds.

[2] Even in Europe it is curious to note how each country is apt to think universities of the other to be rather schools than universities. The Germ call Oxford and Cambridge schools, because they have hitherto given com

the external seeming and organization — the skeleton plan, so to speak — of a university with the actual performance of a rather raw school.

Moreover, the American universities and colleges are in a state of transition. True, nearly everything in America is changing, the apparently inflexible Constitution not excepted. But the changes that are passing in the universities are only to be paralleled by those that pass upon Western cities. The number of small colleges, especially in the Mississippi and Pacific States, is increasing. The character of the Eastern universities is being constantly modified. The former multiply, because, under the Federal system, every State likes to have its own universities numerous, and its inhabitants independent of other States, even as respects education; while the abundance of wealth, the desire of rich men to commemorate themselves and to benefit their community, and the rivalry of the churches, lead to the establishment of new colleges where none are needed, and where money would be better spent in improving those which exist. Individualism and *laissez faire* have, in this matter at least, free scope, for a State legislature is always ready to charter any number of new degree-giving bodies.[1] Meanwhile, the great institutions of the Atlantic States continue to expand and develop, not merely owing to the accretion of wealth to them from the liberality of benefactors, but because they are in close touch with Europe, resolved to bring their highest education up to the European level and to keep pace with the progress of science, filled with that love of experiment and spirit of enterprise which are so much stronger in America than anywhere else in the world.

Not the least interesting of the phenomena of to-day is the struggle which goes on in the Middle and Western States between the greater, and especially the State universities, and the small denominational colleges. The latter, which used to have the field to themselves, are now afraid of being driven

tively little professional and specialized teaching. The English call the Scotch universities schools because many of their students enter at fifteen.

[1] The New York legislature recently offered a charter to the Chautauqua Gathering, one of the most interesting institutions in America, standing midway between a university and a camp-meeting, and representing both the religious spirit and the love of knowledge which characterize the better part of the native American masses.

off it by the growth of the former, and are redoubling th exertions not only to increase their own resources and studen but — at least in some States — to prevent the State universi from obtaining larger grants from the State treasury. Th allege that the unsectarian character of the State establis ments, as well as the freedom allowed to their students, mak them less capable of giving a moral and religious trainin But as the graduates of the State universities become num ous in the legislatures and influential generally, and as it more and more clearly seen that the small colleges cannot, f want of funds, provide the various appliances — librari museums, laboratories, and so forth — which universities nee the balance seems likely to incline in favour of the State u versities. It is probable that while these will rise towards t level of their Eastern sisters, many of the denominatio colleges will subside into the position of places of preparato training.

One praise which has often been given to the universities Scotland may be given to those of America. While the Germ universities have been popular but not free, while the Engli universities have been free[1] but not popular, the Americ universities have been both free and popular. Although so have been managed on too narrow a basis, the number has be so great that the community have not suffered. They ha been established so easily, they have so fully reflected t habits and conditions of the people, as to have been accessib to every stratum of the population. They show all the mer and all the faults of a development absolutely uncontrolled government, and little controlled even by the law which bin endowments down to the purposes fixed by a founder,[2] becau new foundations were constantly rising, and new endowmen were accruing to the existing foundations. Accordingly, wh a European observer is struck by their inequalities and the crudeness of many among them, he is also struck by t

[1] Free as regards self-government in matters of education, for they w tightly bound by theological restrictions till A.D. 1871.

[2] The law of most American States has not yet recognized the necessity providing proper methods for setting aside the dispositions made by found when circumstances change or their regulations prove unsuitable. End menc, if they continue to increase at their present rate, will become a v doubtful blessing unless this question is boldly dealt with.

ife, the spirit, the sense of progress, which pervade them. In America itself educational reformers are apt to deplore the absence of control. They complain of the multiplication of degree-giving bodies, and consequent lowering of the worth of a degree. They point to the dissipation over more than thirty colleges, as in Ohio, of the funds and teaching power which might have produced one first-rate university. One strong institution in a State does more, they argue, to raise the standard of teaching and learning, and to civilize the region which it serves, than can be done by twenty weak ones.

The European observer, while he admits this, conceives that his American friends may not duly realize the services which these small colleges perform in the rural districts of the country. They get hold of a multitude of poor men, who might never resort to a distant place of education. They set learning in a visible form, plain, indeed, and humble, but dignified even in her humility, before the eyes of a rustic people, in whom the love of knowledge, naturally strong, might never break from the bud into the flower but for the care of some zealous gardener. They give the chance of rising in some intellectual walk of life to many a strong and earnest nature who might otherwise have remained an artisan or storekeeper, and perhaps failed in those avocations. They light up in many a country town what is at first only a farthing rushlight, but which, when the town swells to a city, or when endowments flow in, or when some able teacher is placed in charge, becomes a lamp of growing flame, which may finally throw its rays over the whole State in which it stands. In some of these smaller Western colleges one finds to-day men of great ability and great attainments, one finds students who are receiving an education quite as thorough, though not always as wide, as the best Eastern universities can give. I do not at all deny that the time for more concentration has come, and that restrictions on the power of granting degrees would be useful. But one who recalls the history of the West during the last fifty years, and bears in mind the tremendous rush of ability and energy towards a purely material development which has marked its people, will feel that this uncontrolled freedom of teaching, this multiplication of small institutions, have done for the country a work which a few State-regulated universities might

have failed to do. The higher learning is in no danger T great universities of the East, as well as one or two in West, are already beginning to rival the ancient universit of Europe. They will soon have far greater funds at th command with which to move towards the same ideal as G many sets before herself; and they have already what better than funds — an ardour and industry among the teach which equals that displayed fifty years ago in Germany by foremost men of the generation which raised the Gern schools to their glorious pre-eminence.

It may be thought that an observer familiar with two u versities which are among the oldest and most famous Europe, and are beyond question the most externally sump ous and beautiful, would be inclined to disparage the co sponding institutions of the United States, whose traditi are comparatively short, and in whose outward aspect ther little to attract the eye or touch the imagination. I have found it so. An Englishman who visits America can ne feel sure how far his judgment has been affected by warmth of the welcome he receives. But if I may venture state the impression which the American universities h made upon me, I will say that while of all the institution the country they are those of which the Americans speak m modestly, and indeed deprecatingly, they are those wh seem to be at this moment making the swiftest progress, to have the brightest promise for the future. They are sup ing exactly those things which European critics have hith found lacking to America: and they are contributing to political as well as to her contemplative life elements inestimable worth.

CHAPTER CVI

THE CHURCHES AND THE CLERGY

In examining the National government and the State governments we have never once had occasion to advert to any ecclesiastical body or question, because with such matters government has in the United States absolutely nothing to do. Of all the differences between the Old World and the New this is perhaps the most salient. Half the wars of Europe, half the internal troubles that have vexed European states, from the Monophysite controversies in the Roman Empire of the fifth century down to the Kulturkampf in the German Empire of the nineteenth, have arisen from theological differences or from the rival claims of church and state. This whole vast chapter of debate and strife has remained virtually unopened in the United States. There is no Established Church. All religious bodies are absolutely equal before the law, and unrecognized by the law, except as voluntary associations of private citizens.

The Federal Constitution contains the following prohibitions: —

> Art. VI. No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.
>
> Amendment I. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof

No attempt has ever been made to alter or infringe upon these provisions. They affect the National government only, placing no inhibition on the States, and leaving the whole subject to their uncontrolled discretion, though subject to the general guarantees against oppression.

Every State constitution contains provisions generally similar to the above. Most declare that every man may worship

God according to his own conscience, or that the free enj ment of all religious sentiments and forms of worship shall held sacred;[1] most also provide that no man shall be co pelled to support or attend any church; some forbid the cr tion of an established church, and many the showing o preference to any particular sect; while many provide that money shall ever be drawn from the State treasury, or fr the funds of any municipal body, to be applied for the ben of any church or sectarian institution or denominational scho Thirty-three constitutions, including those of the six r States, forbid any religious test to be required as a qualif tion for office; some declare that this principle extends to civil rights; some specify that religious belief is not to af a man's competence as a witness. But in several States th still exist qualifications worth noting. Vermont and D ware declare that every sect ought to maintain some form religious worship, and Vermont adds that it ought to obse the Lord's Day. Six Southern States exclude from office one who denies the existence of a Supreme Being. Bes these six, Pennsylvania and Tennessee pronounce a man eligible for office who does not believe in God and in a fut state of rewards and punishments. Maryland and Arkan even make such a person incompetent as a juror or witne Religious freedom has been generally thought of in Ame in the form of freedom and equality as between different s of Christians, or at any rate different sorts of theists; pers opposed to religion altogether have till recently been tremely few everywhere and practically unknown in the So The neutrality of the State cannot therefore be said to theoretically complete.[3]

In earlier days the States were very far from being neut Those of New England, except Rhode Island, began wit sort of Puritan theocracy, and excluded from some civil ri

[1] Four States provide that this declaration is not to be taken to ex breaches of the public peace, many that it shall not excuse acts of licent ness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the S and three that no person shall disturb others in their religious worship.

[2] Full details on these points will be found in Mr. Stimson's valuable e tion entitled *American Statute Law*.

[3] Nevada and Idaho have recently disfranchised all Mormons res within their respective bounds; but Mormonism is attacked not so much religion as in respect of its social features and hierarchical character.

ersons who stood outside the religious community. Congre-
ationalism was the ruling faith, and Roman Catholics, Quak-
rs, and Baptists were treated with great severity. The early
onstitutions of several States recognized what was virtually
State church, requiring each locality to provide for and sup-
ort the public worship of God. It was not till 1818 that
onnecticut in adopting her new constitution placed all relig-
ous bodies on a level, and left the maintenance of churches to
he voluntary action of the faithful. In Massachusetts a tax
or the support of the Congregationalist churches was imposed
n all citizens not belonging to some other incorporated relig-
ous body until 1811, and religious equality was first fully
ecognized by a constitutional amendment of 1833. In Virginia,
orth and South Carolina, and Maryland, Protestant Episco-
acy was the established form of religion till the Revolution,
hen under the impulse of the democratic spirit, and all the
ore heartily because the Anglican clergy were prone to
oryism (as attachment to the British connection was called),
nd because, at least in Virginia, there had been some per-
ecution of Nonconformists, all religious distinctions were
olished and special ecclesiastical privileges withdrawn.
n Pennsylvania no church was ever legally established. In
ew York, however, first the Dutch Reformed, and afterwards
he Anglican Church had in colonial days enjoyed a measure
State favour. What is remarkable is that in all these cases
he disestablishment, if one may call it by that name, of the
rivileged church was accomplished with no great effort, and
ft very little rancour behind. In the South it seemed a
atural outcome of the Revolution. In New England it came
ore gradually, as the necessary result of the political devel-
ment of each commonwealth. The ecclesiastical arrange-
ents of the States were not inwoven with the pecuniary
terests of any wealthy or socially dominant class; and it
as felt that equality and democratic doctrine generally were
o palpably opposed to the maintenance of any privileges in
ligious matters to be defensible in argument. However,
th in Connecticut and Massachusetts there was a political
ruggle over the process of disestablishment, and the Con-
egationalist ministers predicted evils from a change which
ey afterwards admitted to have turned out a blessing to their

own churches. No voice has ever since been raised in fav of reverting — I will not say to a State establishment of ligion — but even to any State endowment, or State regu tion of ecclesiastical bodies. It is accepted as an axiom all Americans that the civil power ought to be not only neut and impartial as between different forms of faith, but ou to leave these matters entirely on one side, regarding them more than it regards the artistic or literary pursuits of citizens.[1] There seem to be no two opinions on this sub in the United States. Even the Protestant Episcopal clergy, who are in many ways disposed to admire and e their brethren in England; even the Roman Catholic bisho whose creed justifies the enforcement of the true faith by secular arm, assure the European visitor that if State est lishment were offered them they would decline it, preferr the freedom they enjoy to any advantages the State could o fer. Every religious community can now organize itself whatever way it pleases, lay down its own rules of faith discipline, create and administer its own system of judicatu raise and apply its funds at its uncontrolled discretion. church established by the State would not be able to do these things, because it would also be controlled by the St and it would be exposed to the envy and jealousy of ot sects.

The only controversies that have arisen regarding S action in religious matters have turned upon the appropriat of public funds to charitable institutions managed by s particular denomination. Such appropriations are expre prohibited in the constitutions of some States. But it m happen that the readiest way of promoting some benevo public purpose is to make a grant of money to an institu already at work, and successfully serving that purpose. this reason may sometimes be truly given, so it is also so times advanced where the real motive is to purchase the po cal support of the denomination to which the institu belongs, or at least of its clergy. In some States, and

[1] There is, however, and has for some time been, a movement, led, I t by some Baptist and Methodist ministers, for obtaining the insertion o name of God in the Federal Constitution. Those who desire this appe hold that the instrument would be thereby in a manner sanctified, and a tinct national recognition of theism expressed.

cularly in New York, State or city legislatures are often harged with giving money to Roman Catholic institutions r the sake of securing the Catholic vote.[1] In these cases, owever, the money always purports to be voted not for a ligious but for a philanthropic or educational purpose. No clesiastical body would be strong enough to obtain any grant its general funds, or any special immunity for its ministers. ne passion for equality in religious as well as secular mat-rs is everywhere in America far too strong to be braved, and thing excites more general disapprobation than any attempt an ecclesiastical organization to interfere in politics. The spicion that the Roman Catholic church uses its power over members to guide their votes for its purposes has more an once given rise to strong anti-Catholic or (as they would called in Canada) Orange movements, such as that which s recently figured so largely in Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, d Illinois under the name of the American Protective ssociation. So the hostility to Mormonism was due not rely to the practice of polygamy, but also to the notion that e hierarchy of the Latter Day Saints constitutes a secret and rannical *imperium in imperio* opposed to the genius of demo-tic institutions.

The refusal of the civil power to protect or endow any form religion is commonly represented in Europe as equivalent a declaration of contemptuous indifference on the part of e State to the spiritual interests of its people. A State ognizing no church is called a godless State; the disestab-hment of a church is described as an act of national impiety. thing can be farther from the American view, to an expla-ion of which it may be well to devote a few lines.

The abstention of the State from interference in matters of th and worship may be advocated on two principles, which y be called the political and the religious. The former sets from the principles of liberty and equality. It holds any empt at compulsion by the civil power to be an infringe-nt on liberty of thought, as well as on liberty of action, ich could be justified only when a practice claiming to be

[1] In 1870 the Roman Catholic schools and charities of New York received e than $400,000 (£80,000); about $72,000 were then also given to other minational institutions.

religious is so obviously anti-social or immoral as to thre the well-being of the community. Religious persecution, in its milder forms, such as disqualifying the members particular sect for public office, is, it conceives, inconsis with the conception of individual freedom and the respect to the primordial rights of the citizen which modern tho has embraced. Even if State action stops short of the position of disabilities, and confines itself to favouring a ticular church, whether by grants of money or by giving spe immunities to its clergy, this is an infringement on equa putting one man at a disadvantage compared with other respect of matters which are (according to the view I am ing) not fit subjects for State cognizance.

The second principle, embodying the more purely relig view of the question, starts from the conception of the ch as a spiritual body existing for spiritual purposes, and mo along spiritual paths. It is an assemblage of men who united by their devotion to an unseen Being, their memor a past divine life, their belief in the possibility of imita that life, so far as human frailty allows, their hopes fo illimitable future. Compulsion of any kind is contrary to nature of such a body, which lives by love and reverence, by law. It desires no State help, feeling that its stre comes from above, and that its kingdom is not of this wo It does not seek for exclusive privileges, conceiving that t would not only create bitterness between itself and o religious bodies, but might attract persons who did not re share its sentiments, while corrupting the simplicity of t who are already its members. Least of all can it subm be controlled by the State, for the State, in such a worl the present, means persons many or most of whom are a to its beliefs and cold to its emotions. The conclusion fol that the church as a spiritual entity will be happiest strongest when it is left absolutely to itself, not patronize the civil power, not restrained by law except when and i far as it may attempt to quit its proper sphere and i meddle in secular affairs.

Of these two views it is the former much more than latter that has moved the American mind. The latter w doubtless be now generally accepted by religious people.

hen the question arose in a practical shape in the earlier ys of the Republic, arguments of the former or political ler were found amply sufficient to settle it, and no practical rpose has since then compelled men either to examine the iritual basis of the church, or to inquire by the light of his- y how far State action has during fifteen centuries helped marred her usefulness. There has, however, been another use at work, I mean the comparatively limited conception the State itself which Americans have formed. The State not to them, as to Germans or Frenchmen, and even to some glish thinkers, an ideal moral power, charged with the duty forming the characters and guiding the lives of its subjects. is more like a commercial company, or perhaps a huge nicipality created for the management of certain business which all who reside within its bounds are interested, ying contributions and expending them on this business of mmon interest, but for the most part leaving the share- lders or burgesses to themselves. That an organization of s kind should trouble itself, otherwise than as matter of lice, with the opinions or conduct of its members, would be unnatural as for a railway company to inquire how many of shareholders were total abstainers. Accordingly it never urs to the average American that there is any reason why ate churches should exist, and he stands amazed at the rmth of European feeling on the matter.

Just because these questions have been long since disposed and excite no present passion, and perhaps also because Americans are more practically easy-going than pedanti- ly exact, the National government and the State govern- nts do give to Christianity a species of recognition incon- tent with the view that civil government should be absolutely utral in religious matters. Each House of Congress has haplain, and opens its proceedings each day with prayers. e President annually after the end of harvest issues a proc- nation ordering a general thanksgiving, and occasionally points a day of fasting and humiliation. So prayers are ered in the State legislatures,[1] and State governors issue eclamations for days of religious observance. Congress in

[1] Though Michigan and Oregon forbid any appropriation of State funds for gious services.

the crisis of the Civil War (July, 1863) requested the Pr dent to appoint a day for humiliation and prayer. In army and navy provision is made for religious services, ducted by chaplains of various denominations, and no culty seems to have been found in reconciling their cla In most States there exist laws punishing blasphemy or pro swearing by the name of God (laws which, however, ar some places openly transgressed and in few or none enforc laws restricting or forbidding trade or labour on the Sabb as well as laws protecting assemblages for religious purp such as camp-meetings or religious processions, from b disturbed. The Bible is (in most States) read in the pu State-supported schools, and though controversies have ar on this head, the practice is evidently in accord with the eral sentiment of the people.

The matter may be summed up by saying that Christia is in fact understood to be, though not the legally establi religion, yet the national religion.[1] So far from thinking t commonwealth godless, the Americans conceive that the r ious character of a government consists in nothing but th ligious belief of the individual citizens, and the conformit their conduct to that belief. They deem the general accept of Christianity to be one of the main sources of their nati prosperity, and their nation a special object of the Di favour.

The legal position of a Christian church is in the Un States simply that of a voluntary association, or group of a ciations, corporate or unincorporate, under the ordinary There is no such thing as a special ecclesiastical law questions, not only of property but of church discipline jurisdiction, are, if brought before the courts of the l dealt with as questions of contract;[2] and the court, whe is obliged to examine a question of theology, as for inst

[1] It has often been said that Christianity is a part of the common law States, as it has been said to be of the common law of England; but o point there have been discrepant judicial opinions, nor can it be said t any specific practical application. A discussion of it may be found in J Story's opinion in the famous Girard will case.

[2] Or otherwise as questions of private civil law. Actions for damag sometimes brought against ecclesiastical authorities by persons deeming selves to have been improperly accused or disciplined or deprived of the e ment of property.

hether a clergyman has advanced opinions inconsistent with ıy creed or formula to which he has bound himself — for it ill prefer, if possible, to leave such matters to the proper ecclesiastical authority — will treat the point as one of pure gal interpretation, neither assuming to itself theological nowledge, nor suffering considerations of policy to inter- ene.[1]

As a rule, every religious body can organize itself in any ay it pleases. The State does not require its leave to be ked, but permits any form of church government, any eccle- astical order, to be created and endowed, any method to be lopted of vesting church property, either simply in trustees in corporate bodies formed either under the general law of ie State or under some special statute. Sometimes a limit imposed on the amount of property, or of real estate, which ı ecclesiastical corporation can hold; but, on the whole, it ay be said that the civil power manifests no jealousy of ie spiritual, but allows the latter a perfectly free field for xpansion. Of course if any ecclesiastical authority were to ecome formidable either by its wealth or by its control over e members of its body, this easy tolerance would disappear; l I observe is that the difficulties often experienced, and still ore often feared, in Europe, from the growth of organizations ercising tremendous spiritual powers, have in the United ates never proved serious.[2] No church has anywhere a ower approaching that of the Roman Catholic Church in ower Canada. Religious bodies are in so far the objects of ecial favour that their property is in most States exempt om taxation; and this is reconciled to theory by the argu- ent that they are serviceable as moral agencies, and diminish e expenses incurred in respect of police administration.[3]

[1] The Emperor Aurelian decided in a like neutral spirit a question that had sen between two Christian churches.

[2] Occasionally a candidate belonging to a particular denomination receives ne sympathetic support from its members. In a recent State election in kansas, as one candidate for the Governorship had been a Baptist minister l the other a Methodist presiding elder, and four-fifths of the voters be- ged to one or other denomination, each received a good deal of denomina- nal adhesion.

[3] In his message of 1881 the Governor of Washington Territory recommended legislature to exempt church property from taxation, not only on the ground t "churches and schoolhouses are the temples of education, and alike con-

Two or three States impose restrictions on the creation religious corporations, and one, Maryland, requires the sa tion of the legislature to dispositions of property to religi uses. But, speaking generally, religious bodies are the obj of legislative favour.[1]

I pass on to say a few words as to the religious bodies the country.[2]

In the eleventh census (1890) an attempt was made to tain from each of these bodies full statistics regarding numbers and the value of its property. The results, whic take from the bulletins and abstracts of that census, were respects the denominations whose membership exceeds 500, persons, as follows: —

Roman Catholics	6,250,045[3]
Methodists (17 bodies)	4,589,284
Baptists (13 bodies)	3,712,468
Presbyterians (12 bodies)	1,278,332
Lutherans (16 bodies)	1,231,072
Disciples of Christ	641,051
Protestant Episcopalians	540,509
Congregationalists	512,771[4]

Besides these eight bodies the Jews are returned as hav 130,496 members (only heads of families, however, be reckoned), the Friends 107,208, the Spiritualists 45,030, eight communistic societies (including the so-called Shak only 4049. The total number of persons returned as com nicants or members of all the churches is 20,612,806.

Of the above-mentioned denominations, or rather groups, most of them include numerous minor denominations,

duce to the cultivation of peace, happiness, and prosperity," but also bec "churches enhance the value of contiguous property, which, were they ished, would be of less value and return less revenue."

[1] New Hampshire has lately taxed churches on the value of their real e exceeding $10,000 (£2000).

[2] An interesting and impartial summary view of the history of the denominations in the United States may be found in Dr. George P. Fis *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 559–582.

[3] All baptized Roman Catholics over nine years of age are treated as m bers.

[4] The total number of ministers of all denominations is returned at 11 the total value of church sites and buildings (including 47 Chinese temple $679,630,139.

Methodists and Baptists are numerous everywhere, but the Methodists especially numerous in the South, where they have been the chief evangelizers of the negroes, and in the Middle States, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois. Of the Congregationalists nearly one-half are to be found in New England, the rest in such parts of the Middle and Western States as have been peopled from New England. The Presbyterians are strongest in Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, New Jersey, and in the older Southern States,[1] especially Virginia and North Carolina, States where many Scoto-Irish emigrants settled, but are well represented over the West also. Of the Lutherans nearly one-half are Germans and one-quarter Scandinavians, including Icelanders and Finns. The Protestant Episcopalians are strongest in New York (which supplies one-fourth of their total number), Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. There are fifty-two dioceses and seventy-five bishops; no archbishop, the supreme authority being vested in a convention which meets triennially. The Unitarians (in all 7,749 with 459 ministers) are very few outside New England and the regions settled from New England, but have exercised an influence far beyond that of their numbers owing to the eminence of some of their divines, such as Channing, Emerson, and Theodore Parker, and to the fact that they include a large number of highly cultivated men. The Roman Catholics are, except in Maryland and Louisiana, nearly all either of Irish, German, Slavonic, or French-Canadian extraction. They abound everywhere, except in the South and some parts of the North-west, and are perhaps, owing to the influx of Irish and French-Canadians, most relatively numerous in New England. The great development of the Lutheran bodies is of course due to German and Scandinavian immigration. Of all denominations the Jews have increased most rapidly, viz. at the rate of 160 per cent for the ten years, 1880–1890. The state with fewest is North Carolina. Of the Orthodox Jews, who are returned as being to the Reformed in the proportion of two to three, half are in New York.

All these phenomena find an easy historical explanation.

[1] The strength of Presbyterianism in the South is probably due in part to the immigration into those States of Ulstermen in the middle of last century, and of settlers from Holland at a still earlier date.

The churches of the United States are the churches of
British Isles, modified by recent immigration from the Eu
pean continent. Each race has, as a rule, adhered to the fo
of religion it held in Europe; and where denominations co
paratively small in England have, like the Methodists a
Baptists, swelled to vast proportions here, it is because
social conditions under which they throve in England w
here reproduced on a far larger scale. In other words,
causes which have given their relative importance and th
local distribution to American denominations have been rac
and social rather than ecclesiastical. No new religious for
have sprung up on American soil to give a new turn to
religious history. The breaking up of large denominati
into smaller religious bodies seems to be due, partly to imi
gration, which has introduced slightly diverse elemer
partly to the tendency to relax the old dogmatic stringen
a tendency which has been found to operate as a fissile for

It need hardly be said that there exist no such social d
tinctions between different denominations as those of Engla
No clergyman, no layman, either looks down upon or looks
to any other clergyman or layman in respect of his worsh
ping God in another way. The Roman Catholic church
course stands aloof from the Protestant Christians, whom
considers schismatic; and although what is popularly cal
the doctrine of apostolic succession is less generally deen
vital by Protestant Episcopalians in America than it has co
to be by them of late years in England, the clergy of t
church seldom admit to their pulpits pastors of other church
though they sometimes appear in the pulpits of those church
Such exchanges of pulpit are common among Presbyteria
Congregationalists, and other orthodox Protestant bodies.
many parts of the North and West the Protestant Episco
church has long been slightly more fashionable than its sis
churches; and people who have no particular "religious pre
ences," but wish to stand well socially, will sometimes
themselves to it.[1] In the South, however, Presbyterian

[1] The proposal which has been more than once made in the annual con
tion of the Protestant Episcopal church, that it should call itself "The Nati
Church of America," has been always rejected by the good sense of the ma
ity, who perceive that an assumption of this kind would provoke much
pleasure from other bodies of Christians.

(and in some places Methodism) is equally well regarded from a worldly point of view; while everywhere the strength of Methodists and Baptists and Roman Catholics resides in the masses of the people.[1]

Of late years proposals for union between some of the leading Protestant churches, and especially between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists and Lutherans, have been freely canvassed. They witness to a growing good feeling among the clergy, and growing indifference to minor points of doctrine and church government. The vested interests of the existing clergy create some difficulties serious in small towns and country districts; but it seems possible that before many years more than one such union will be carried through.

The social standing of the clergy of each church corresponds pretty closely to the character of the church itself — that is to say, the pastors of the Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Episcopalian, and Unitarian bodies come generally from a higher social stratum than those of other more numerous denominations. The former are almost universally graduates of some university or college, have there mixed with other young men belonging to the better families of the place where they reside, and have obtained that university stamp which is much prized in America. As in Great Britain, comparatively few are the sons of the wealthy; and few come from the working classes. The position of a minister of the Gospel always carries with it some dignity — that is to say, it gives a man a certain advantage in the society, whatever it may be, to which he naturally belongs in respect of his family connections, his means, and his education. In the great cities the leading ministers of the chief denominations, including the Roman Catholic and Protestant Episcopal bishops, whether they be eminent as preachers or as active philanthropists, or in respect of their learning, are among the first citizens, and exercise an influence often wider and more powerful than that of any layman. Possibly no man in the United States, since President Lincoln, has been so warmly admired and so widely mourned as the late Dr. Phillips Brooks. In cities of the second order, the clergymen

[1] The Methodists and Baptists are said to make more use of social means in the work of evangelizing the masses, and to adapt themselves more perfectly to democratic ideas than do the other Protestant bodies.

of these denominations, supposing them (as is usually the cas to be men of good breeding and personally acceptable, move the best society of the place. Similarly in country places t pastor is better educated and more enlightened than the avera members of his flock, and becomes a leader in works of bene cence. The level of education and learning is rising amo the clergy with the steady improvement of the universitie This advance is perhaps most marked among those denomin tions which, like the Methodists and Baptists, have heretofo lagged behind, because their adherents were mostly among t poor. So far as I could learn, the incomes of the clergy a also increasing. The highest are those received by the Presb terian and Congregationalist pastors in the great cities, whi run from $8000 up to $15,000, and by the Protestant Ep copal bishops ($3300 up to $12,500). Roman Catholic bisho being celibate and with poorer flocks, have from $3000 $5000; Methodist bishops usually $5000, with travelling e penses. In the wealthier denominations there are many c ministers whose incomes exceed $3000, while in small tow and rural districts few fall below $1000; in the less wealt $1500 for a city and $700 for a rural charge may be a f average as regards the North and West. The average sala of a Roman Catholic priest is given at $800.[1] To the su regularly paid must be added in many cases a residence, a in nearly all various gifts and fees which the minister receiv

These figures, which, however, must be a little reduced the Southern States, compare favourably with the incom received by the clergy in England or Scotland, and are course much above the salaries paid to priests in France or Protestant pastors in Germany. Reckoning in the clergy all denominations in Great Britain and in the United Stat I think that, so far as it is possible to strike an average, b the pecuniary and the social position of the American cle must be pronounced slightly better.

Although the influence of the clergy is still great it

[1] Most of these figures are drawn from an interesting article in the *For* for August, 1894, by Mr. H. K. Carroll, acting superintendent of the cen See also an article by the same judicious authority in the *Forum* for Ju 1892. Some instructive remarks on the relation of the universities to clergy may be found in an article by Mr. F. G. Peabody in the same maga for September, 1894.

changed its nature, yielding to the universal current which makes for equality. At the beginning of the century the New England ministers enjoyed a local authority not unlike that of the bishops in Western Europe in the sixth century or of the Presbyterian ministers of Scotland in the seventeenth. They were, especially in country places, the leaders as well as instructors of their congregations, and were a power in politics scarcely less than in spiritual affairs.[1] That order of things has quite passed away. His profession and his education still secure respect for a clergyman,[2] but he must not now interfere in politics; he must not speak on any secular subject *ex cathedra;* his influence, whatever it may be, is no longer official but can only be that of a citizen distinguished by his talents or character, whose office gives him no greater advantage than that of an eminence where shining gifts may be more widely visible. Now and then this rule of abstention from politics is broken through. Mr. Henry Ward Beecher took the field as a Mugwump in the presidential campaign of 1884, and was deemed the more courageous in doing so because the congregation of Plymouth Church were mostly "straight out" Republicans. The Roman Catholic bishops are sometimes accused of lending secret aid to the political party which will procure subventions for their schools and charities, and do no doubt, as indeed their doctrines require, press warmly the claims of denominational education. But otherwise they also abstain from politics. Such action as is constantly taken in England by ministers of the Established Church on the one side of politics, by Nonconformist ministers on the other, would in America excite disapproval. It is only on platforms or in conventions where some moral cause is to be advocated, such as Abolitionism was thirty

[1] In some States clergymen are still declared ineligible, by the constitution, as members of a State legislature. They do not seem to have in the early days sat in these bodies; and they very rarely sit in Congress, but one finds them in conventions. Some of the best speeches in the Massachusetts Convention of 1788 which ratified the Federal Constitution were made by ministers. In New England, they were all or nearly all advocates of the Constitution, and passed into the Federalist party.

[2] The clergy are the objects of a good deal of favour in various small ways; for instance, they often receive free passes on railroads, and the Inter-State Commerce Act of 1887, while forbidding the system of granting free passes, which had been much abused, specially exempted clergymen from the prohibition. Their children are usually educated at lower fees, or even gratis, in colleges, and storekeepers often allow them a discount.

years ago or temperance is now, that clergymen can wit impunity appear.

Considering that the absence of State interference in matte of religion is one of the most striking differences between a the European countries on the one hand and the United State on the other, the European reader may naturally expect som further remarks on the practical results of this divergenc "There are," he will say, "two evil consequences with whic the European defenders of established churches seek to terri us when disestablishment and disendowment are mentione one that the authority and influence of religion will wane State recognition is withdrawn, the other that the incomes the clergy and their social status will sink, that they will fact become plebeians, and that the centres of light which no exist in every country parish will be extinguished. There a also two benefits which the advocates of the 'Free Church in Free State' promise us, one that social jealousies and bitte nesses between different sects will melt away, and the oth that the church will herself become more spiritual in h temper and ideas, more earnest in her proper work of mor reform and the nurture of the soul. What has American e perience to say on these four points?"

These are questions so pertinent to a right conception of t ecclesiastical side of American life that I cannot decline t duty of trying to answer them, though reluctant to tread ground to which European conflicts give a controversial cha acter.

I. To estimate the influence and authority of religion is n easy. Suppose, however, that we take either the habit attending church or the sale of religious books as evidences its influence among the multitude: suppose that as regards t more cultivated classes we look at the amount of respect pa to Christian precepts and ministers, the interest taken in the logical questions, the connection of philanthropic reforms wi religion. Adding these various data together, we may get so sort of notion of the influence of religion on the Americ people as a whole.

Purposing to touch on these points in the chapter next f lowing, I will here only say by way of anticipation that in these respects the influence of Christianity seems to be, if

look not merely to the numbers but also to the intelligence of the persons influenced, greater and more widespread in the United States than in any part of western Continental Europe, and I think greater than in England. In France, Italy, Spain, and the Catholic parts of Germany, as well as in German Austria, the authority of religion over the masses is of course great. Its influence on the best educated classes — one must include all parts of society in order to form a fair judgment — is apparently smaller in France and Italy than in Great Britain, and I think distinctly smaller than in the United States. The country which most resembles America in this respect is Scotland, where the mass of the people enjoy large rights in the management of their church affairs, and where the interest of all classes has, ever since the Reformation, tended to run in ecclesiastical channels. So far from suffering from the want of State support, religion seems in the United States to stand all the firmer because, standing alone, she is seen to stand by her own strength. No political party, no class in the community, has any hostility either to Christianity or to any particular Christian body. The churches are as thoroughly popular, in the best sense of the word, as any of the other institutions of the country.

II. The social and economic position of the clergy in the United States is above that of the priesthood, taken as a whole, in Roman Catholic countries, and of all denominations, Anglican and Nonconformist, in England. No American pastors enjoy such revenues as the prelates of England and Hungary; but the average income attached to the pastoral office is in America larger. The peculiar conditions of England, where one church looks down socially on the others, make a comparison in other respects difficult. The education of the American ministers, their manners, their capacity for spreading light among the people, seem superior to those of the seminarist priesthood of France and Italy (who are of course far more of a distinct caste) and equal to those of the Protestant pastors of Germany and Scotland.

III. Social jealousies connected with religion scarcely exist in America, and one notes a kindlier feeling between all denominations, Roman Catholics included, a greater readiness to work together for common charitable aims, than between

Catholics and Protestants in France or Germany, or betwe
Anglicans and Nonconformists in England. There is a rival
between the leading denominations to extend their bounds,
erect and fill new churches, to raise great sums for chur
purposes. But it is a friendly rivalry, which does not provo
bad blood, because the State stands neutral, and all churcl
have a free field. There is much less mutual exclusivene
than in any other country, except perhaps Scotland. A
instance may be found in the habit of exchanging pulpi
another in the comparative frequency with which persons pa
from one denomination to another, if a particular clergym
attracts them, or if they settle in a place distant from a chur
of their own body. One often finds members of the sa
family belonging to different denominations. Some of t
leading bodies, and especially the Presbyterians and Cong
gationalists, between whose doctrines there exists practica
no difference, have been wont, especially in the West,
co-operate for the sake of efficiency and economy in agreei
not to plant two rival churches in a place where one w
suffice, but to arrange that one denomination shall set up
church, and the other advise its adherents to join and supp
that church.

IV. To give an opinion on the three foregoing questions
incomparably easier than to say whether and how much Chr
tianity has gained in spiritual purity and dignity by
severance from the secular power.

There is a spiritual gain in that diminution of envy, mali
and uncharitableness between the clergy of various sects wh
has resulted from their being all on the same legal level; a
the absence both of these faults and of the habit of bring
ecclesiastical questions into secular politics, gives the ene
less occasion to blaspheme than he is apt to have in Euro
Church assemblies — synods, conferences, and conventions
seem on the whole to be conducted with better temper and m
good sense than these bodies have shown in the Old Wor
from the Council of Ephesus down to and in our own d
But in America as elsewhere some young men enter the cleri
profession from temporal motives; some laymen join a chu
to improve their social or even their business position; so
country pastors look out for city cures, and justify their leav

poorer flock for a richer by talking of a wider sphere of use-
ness. The desire to push the progress of the particular
urch or of the denomination often mingles with the desire to
each the gospel more widely; and the gospel is sometimes
eached, if not with "respect of persons" yet with less faith-
insistence on unpalatable truths than the moral health of
community requires.

So far as I could ascertain, the dependence of the minister
his support on his congregation does not lower him in their
es, nor make him more apt to flatter the leading members
an he is in established churches. If he is personally digni-
d and unselfish, his independence will be in no danger. But
ether the voluntary system, which no doubt makes men
re liberal in giving for the support of religious ordinances
ong themselves and of missions elsewhere, tends to quicken
ritual life, and to keep the church pure and undefiled, free
m the corrupting influences of the world, is another matter,
which a stranger may well hesitate to speak. Those Ameri-
ns whose opinion I have inquired are unanimous in holding
t in this respect also the fruits of freedom have been good.

CHAPTER CVII

THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGION

To convey some impression of the character and type w
religion has taken in America, and to estimate its influen
a moral and spiritual force, is an infinitely harder task
to sketch the salient ecclesiastical phenomena of the cou
I approach it with the greatest diffidence, and do not pr
to give anything more than the sifted result of answe
questions addressed to many competent observers belo
to various churches or to none.

An obviously important point to determine is the e
to which the external ministrations of religion are suppli
the people and used by them. This is a matter on w
no trustworthy statistics seem attainable, but on which
visitor's own eyes leave him in little doubt. There
churches everywhere, and everywhere equally: in the
and in the country, in the North and in the South, in the
nooks of New England, in the settlements which have sp
up along railroads in the West. It is only in the very r
est parts of the West, and especially in the region of m
camps, that they are wanting, and the want is but tempo
for "home missionary" societies are quickly in the field
provide the ministrations of religion even to this migr
population. In many a town of moderate size one fi
church for every thousand inhabitants, as was the case
Dayton, in Ohio, which, when it had 40,000 people, had
forty churches.

Denominational rivalry has counted for something i
rapid creation of churches in the newly settled West and
multiplication everywhere else. Small churches are
times maintained out of pride when it would be better
them be united with other congregations of the same

the attendance is generally good. In cities of moderate , as well as in small towns and country places, a stranger ld that the bulk of the native American population go to rch at least once every Sunday. In the great cities the portion of those who attend is far smaller, but whether or as small as in English cities no one could tell me. One is h struck by the habit of church-going in the more settled s of the Far West where the people, being new-comers, ht be supposed to be less under the sway of habit and vention. California is an exception, and is the State sup- d to be least affected by religious influences. But in the f city of Oregon I found that a person, and especially a , who did not belong to some church and attend it pretty larly, would be looked askance on. She need not actually caste, but the fact would excite surprise and regret; and disquieted friends would put some pressure upon her to l herself as a church member.

he observance of the Sabbath as it was, or the Sunday as it w more usually, called, furnishes another test. Although strictness of Puritan practice has disappeared, even in England, the American part of the rural population, cially in the South, refrains from amusement as well as work.[1] It is otherwise with the Germans; and in some s of the country their example has brought in laxity as

n interesting summary of the laws for the observance of Sunday may und in a paper read by Mr. Henry E. Young at the Third Annual Meet- f the American Bar Association (1880). These laws, which seem to in every State, are in many cases very strict, forbidding all labour, t works of necessity and mercy, and in many cases forbidding also lling and nearly every kind of amusement. Vermont and South Carolina to go farthest in this direction. The former prescribes, under a fine of hat no one shall "visit from house to house, except from motives manity or charity, or travel from midnight of Saturday to midnight of ay, or hold or attend any ball or dance, or use any game, sport, or play, ort to any house of entertainment for amusement or recreation."

Indiana, where all labour and "engaging in one's usual avocation" are bited, it has been held by the Courts that "selling a cigar to one who has acted the habit of smoking is a work of necessity."

uth Carolina winds up a minute series of prohibitions by ordering all us to apply themselves to the observance of the day by exercising them- thereon in the duties of piety and true religion. It need hardly be said hese laws are practically obsolete, except so far as they forbid ordinary nnecessary traffic and labour. To that extent they are supported by sentiment, and are justified as being in the nature not so much of ous as of socially and economically useful regulations.

regards amusement. Such cities as Chicago, Cincinnati, Orleans, and San Francisco have a Sunday quite unlike of New England, and more resembling what one fin Germany or France. Nowhere however does one see the open or ordinary work done. On many railroads there ar Sunday trains, and museums are in many cities closed. I two respects the practice is more lax than in Great Br Most of the leading newspapers publish Sunday editions, contain a great deal of general readable matter, stories, g and so forth, over and above the news of the day; and i great cities theatres are now open on Sunday evenings.[1]

The interest in theological questions is less keen than in New England a century ago, but keener than it has gen been in England since the days of the Commonwealth. A deal of the ordinary reading of the average family has gious tinge, being supplied in religious or semi-religious w and monthly magazines. In many parts of the West t problems of predestination, reprobation, and election co to be discussed by farmers and shopkeepers in their moments with the old eagerness, and give a sombre ti their views of religion. The ordinary man knows the better, and takes up an allusion to it more quickly tha ordinary Englishman, though perhaps not better than th nary Scotchman. Indeed I may say once for all tha native American in everything concerning theology re one much more of Scotland than of England, although general cast and turn of his mind he is far more Englis Scotch. It is hard to state any general view as to th stance of pulpit teaching, because the differences be different denominations are marked; but on the who tendency has been, alike among Congregationalists, Ba Northern Presbyterians, and Episcopalians, for sermons less metaphysical and less markedly doctrinal than for and to become either expository or else of a practic hortatory character. This is less the case among the Pre rians of the South, who are more stringently orthodox,

[1] One hears that it is now becoming the custom to make a week's ment of an operatic or theatrical company — there are many travers country — begin on Sunday instead of, as formerly, on Monday night.

Boston, Philadelphia, and New York have opened their public l museums, and art galleries on Sunday.

respects more conservative than their brethren of the North. discussion of the leading theological questions of the day, h as those of the authority of Scripture, the relation of natural nce to the teachings of the Bible, the existence of rewards punishments in a future state, goes on much as in England. ne of the leading reviews and magazines publish articles on se subjects, which are read more widely than corresponding cles in England, but do not, I think, absorb any more of the ught and attention of the average educated man and woman. Whether scepticism makes any sensible advance either in cting a larger number of minds, or in cutting more deeply the roots of their belief in God and immortality, is a stion which it is to-day extremely difficult for any one to wer even as regards his own country. There are many nomena in every part of Europe which appear to indicate it does advance; there are others which point in the oppo- direction. Much more difficult, then, must it be for a nger to express a positive opinion as regards America on gravest of all subjects of inquiry. The conditions of land and America appear to me very similar, and what- tendency prevails in either country is likely to prevail in other. The mental habits of the people are the same; r fundamental religious conceptions are the same, except those who prize a visible Church and bow to her authority relatively fewer among American Protestants; their theo- cal literature is the same. In discussing a theological stion with an American one never feels that slight differ- of point of view, or, so to speak, of mental atmosphere, ch is sure to crop up in talking to a Frenchman or an an, or even to a German. Considerations of speculative ment, considerations of religious feeling, affect the two ons in the same way: the course of their religious history ot likely to diverge. If there be a difference at all in their ent attitude, it is perhaps to be found in this, that whereas ricans are more frequently disposed to treat minor issues bold and free spirit, they are more apt to recoil from blank tion. As an American once said to me — they are apt to serious views into familiar words — "We don't mind going od way along the plank, but we like to stop short of the o-off."

Whether pronounced theological unbelief, which has la
been preached by lectures and pamphlets with a fre
unknown even thirty years ago, has made substantial pro
among the thinking part of the working class is a questi
which one hears the most opposite statements. I have
statistics which purport to show that the proportion of
bers of Christian churches to the total population has ris
the Protestant churches from 1 in 14½ in A.D. 1800 to 1
in A.D. 1880; and which estimate the number of communi
in 1880 at 12,000,000, the total adult population in that
being taken at 25,000,000. So the census of churches of
gives the number of church members or communican
20,000,000 out of an adult population which may be tak
31,000,000. But one also hears many lamentations ove
diminished attendance at city churches; and in ecclesia
circles people say, just as they say in England, that the
problem is how to reach the masses. The most probabl
clusion seems to be that while in cities like New York
Chicago the bulk of the humbler classes (except the R
Catholics, who are largely recent immigrants) are pract
heathen to the same extent as in London, or Liverpo
Berlin, the proportion of working men who belong to
religious body is rather larger in towns under 30,000 tha
in the similar towns of Great Britain or Germany.

In the cultivated circles of the great cities one finds a
many people, as one does in England, who have vir
abandoned Christianity; and in most of the smaller cities
is said to be a knot of men who profess agnosticism
sometimes have a meeting-place where secularist lectur
delivered. Fifty years ago the former class would have
fewer and more reserved; the latter would scarcely
existed. But the relaxation of the old strictness of orth
has not diminished the zeal of the various churches, nor
hold upon their adherents, nor their attachment to the
mental doctrines of Christianity.

This zeal and attachment happily no longer show them
in intolerance. Except in small places in the West or
where aggressive scepticism would rouse displeasure and
affect a man's position in society, everybody is as f
America as in London to hold and express any views he p

ithin the churches themselves there is an unmistakable ndency to loosen the bonds of subscription required from rgymen. Prosecutions for heresy of course come before urch courts, since no civil court would take cognizance of h matters unless when invoked by some one alleging that hurch court had given a decision, or a church authority had ken an executive step, which prejudiced him in some civil ht, and was unjust because violating an obligation contracted h him.[1] Such prosecutions are not uncommon, but the npathy of the public is usually with the accused minister, d the latitude allowed to divergence from the old standards omes constantly greater. At present it is in the Congrega-nalist church pretty much the same as in that church in gland; in the Presbyterian church of the North, and among ptists and Methodists, slightly less than in the unestablished sbyterian churches of Scotland. Speaking generally, no thodox) church allows quite so much latitude either in trine or in ritual as recent decisions of the courts of law, inning from the "Essays and Reviews" case, have allowed he clergy of the Anglican Establishment in England; but ould not gather that the clergy of the various Protestant lies feel themselves fettered, or that the free development religious thought is seriously checked, except in the South, ere orthodoxy is rigid, and forbids a clergyman to hold Mr. rwin's views regarding the descent of man.[2] A pastor who ins to chafe under the formularies or liturgy of his denom-tion would be expected to leave the denomination and join ne other in which he could feel more at home. He would suffer socially by doing so, as an Anglican clergyman sibly might in the like case in England. In the Roman holic church there is, of course, no similar indulgence to a iation from the ancient dogmatic standards; but there is reater disposition to welcome the newer forms of learning culture than one finds in England or Ireland, and what be called a more pronounced democratic spirit. So among younger Protestant clergy there has been of late years a

[1] Including the case in which a church court had disregarded its own regu-ns, or acted in violation of the plain principles of judicial procedure.

[2] Not long ago, a professor, not in the theological faculty, was removed his chair in the University of South Carolina for holding Unitarian s.

tendency, if not to socialism, yet to a marked discontent existing economic conditions, resembling what is now pe tible among the younger clergy in Britain.

As respects what may be called the every-day religious and usages of the United States, there are differences those of England or Scotland which it is easy to feel but to define or describe. There is rather less conventionalis constraint in speaking of religious experiences, less of a fe separation between the church and the world, less dispos to treat the clergy as a caste and expect them to conform standard not prescribed for the layman,[1] less reticence sacred things, perhaps less sense of the refinement with v sacred things ought to be surrounded. The letting by au of sittings in a popular church, though I think very excites less disapproval than it would in Europe. Some ionable churches are supplied with sofas, carpets, and the comforts of a drawing-room; a well-trained choir is prov and the congregation would not think of spoiling the per ance by joining in the singing. The social side of churc is more fully developed than in Protestant Europe. A gregation, particularly among the Methodists, Baptists Congregationalists, is the centre of a group of societies, ary and recreative as well as religious and philanth which not only stimulate charitable work, but bring the p and richer members into friendly relations with one an and form a large part of the social enjoyments of the y people, keeping them out of harm's way, and giving th means of forming acquaintances. Often a sort of inf evening party, called a "sociable," is given once a mon which all ages and classes meet on an easy footing.[2] Re seems to associate itself better with the interests of the y

[1] Although total abstinence is much more generally expected from a man than it would be in Great Britain. In most denominations, inc Baptists and Methodists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians, it is cally universal among the clergy.

[2] Even dances may be given, but not by all denominations. Whe years ago a Presbyterian congregation in a great Western city was g "reception" in honour of the opening of its new Church Building — pros churches always have a building with a set of rooms for meetings — the (as he is called in America), who had come from a Protestant Ep church in the East, observed, as he surveyed the spacious hall, "What you are not Episcopalians; you might have given a ball in this room!"

America, and to have come within the last forty years to ear a less forbidding countenance than it has generally done Britain, or at least among English Nonconformists and in e churches of Scotland.

A still more peculiar feature of the American churches is the ropensity to what may be called Revivalism which some of em, and especially the Methodist churches, show. That xciting preaching and those external demonstrations of feeling hich have occasionally appeared in Britain, have long been ronic there, appearing chiefly in the form of the camp-meet-g, a gathering of people usually in the woods or on the sea-ore, where open-air preaching goes on perhaps for days gether. One hears many stories about these camp-meetings, t always to their credit, which agree at least in this, that ey exercise a powerful even if transient influence upon the mbler classes who flock to them. In the West they have en serviceable in evangelizing districts where few regular urches had yet been established. In the East and South it now chiefly among the humbler classes, and of course still ore among the negroes, that they flourish. All denomina-ns are more prone to emotionalism in religion, and have less serve in displaying it, than in England or Scotland. I re-mber in 1870 to have been a passenger by one of the splen-l steamers which ply along the Sound between New York d Fall River. A Unitarian Congress was being held in New rk, and a company of New England Unitarians were going attend it. Now New England Unitarians are of all Ameri-ns perhaps the most staid and sober in their thoughts and bits, the least inclined to a demonstrative expression of their th. This company, however, installed itself round the piano the great saloon of the vessel and sang hymns, hymns full effusion, for nearly two hours, many of the other passengers ning, and all looking on with sympathy. Our English party umed at first that the singers belonged to some Methodist dy, in which case there would have been nothing to remark cept the attitude of the bystanders. But they were Uni-ians.

European travellers have in one point greatly exaggerated differences between their own continent and the United tes. They have represented the latter as pre-eminently a

land of strange sects and abnormal religious developmen
Such sects and developments there certainly are, but they p
no greater part in the whole life of the nation than similar se
do in Germany and England, far less than the various disse
ing communities do in Russia. The Mormons have drawn t
eyes of the world because they have attempted to form a s
of religious commonwealth, and have revived one ancient pr
tice which modern ethics condemn, and which severe c
gressional legislation has now almost stamped out. But t
Mormon church is chiefly recruited from Europe; one fi
few native Americans in Salt Lake City, and those few fr
among the poor whites of the South.[1] The Shakers are
interesting and well-conducted folk, but there are very few
them, and they decrease — there were in 1890 only 1728 p
sons in their fifteen communities; while of the other comm
nistic religious bodies one hears more in Europe than in Ameri
Here and there some strange little sect emerges and lives fo
few years;[2] but in a country seething with religious emoti
and whose conditions seem to tempt to new departures a
experiments of all kinds, the philosophic traveller may rat
wonder that men have stood so generally upon the old path

We have already seen that Christianity has in the Uni
States maintained, so far as externals go, its authority a
dignity, planting its houses of worship all over the coun
and raising enormous revenues from its adherents. Such
position of apparent influence might, however, rest upon
cient habit and convention, and imply no dominion over
souls of men. The Roman Empire in the days of Augus
was covered from end to end with superb temples to ma
gods; the priests were numerous and wealthy, and enjo

[1] There is a non-polygamous Mormon church, rejecting Brigham Yo
and his successors in Utah, which returns itself to the census of 1890 as ha
21,773 members. Some Southern States punish the preaching of Mormon

[2] Near Walla Walla in the State of Washington I came across a curious
formed by a Welshman who fell into trances and delivered revelations.
had two sons, and asserted one of them to be an incarnation of Christ, and
other of St. John the Baptist, and gathered about fifty disciples, whom
endeavoured to form into a society having all things in common. Howe
both the children died; and in 1881 most of his disciples had deserted
Probably such phenomena are not uncommon; there is a good deal of pr
ness to superstition among the less educated Westerns, especially the in
grants from Europe. They lead a solitary life in the midst of a vast natu

ne protection of the State; processions retained their pomp, nd sacrifices drew crowds of admiring worshippers. But the ld religions had lost their hold on the belief of the educated nd on the conscience of all classes. If therefore we desire to now what place Christianity really fills in America, and how ar it gives stability to the commonwealth, we must inquire ow far it governs the life and moulds the mind of the ountry.

Such an inquiry may address itself to two points. It may xamine into the influence which religion has on the conduct f the people, on their moral standard and the way they con- orm themselves thereto. And it may ask how far religion ouches and gilds the imagination of the people, redeeming heir lives from commonness, and bathing their souls in "the ght that never was on sea or land."

In works of active beneficence no country has surpassed, erhaps none has equalled, the United States. Not only are he sums collected for all sorts of philanthropic purposes arger relatively to the wealth of America than in any Euro- ean country, but the amount of personal interest shown in ood works and personal effort devoted to them seems to a uropean visitor to exceed what he knows at home. How uch of this interest and effort would be given were no reli- ious motive present it is impossible to say. Not all, but I hink nearly all of it, is in fact given by religious people, and, s they themselves suppose, under a religious impulse. This eligious impulse is less frequently than in England a sectarian mpulse, for all Protestants, and to some extent Roman Cath- ics also, are wont to join hands for most works of benevo- nce.

The ethical standard of the average man is of course the hristian standard, modified to some slight extent by the cir- mstances of American life, which have been different from ose of Protestant Europe. The average man has not thought any other standard, and religious teaching, though it has come less definite and less dogmatic, is still to him the urce whence he believes himself to have drawn his ideas duty and conduct. In Puritan days there must have been me little conscious and much more unconscious hypocrisy, e profession of religion being universal, and the exactitude

of practice required by opinion, and even by law, being abo
what ordinary human nature seems capable of attaining. T
fault of antinomianism which used to be charged on hi
Calvinists is now sometimes charged on those who becon
under the influence of revivals, extreme emotionalists in re
gion. But taking the native Americans as a whole, no peo
seems to-day less open to the charge of pharisaism or hyp
risy. They are perhaps rather more prone to the oppos
error of good-natured indulgence to offences of which they
not themselves guilty.

That there is less crime among native Americans than amo
the foreign born is a point not to be greatly pressed, for
may be partly due to the fact that the latter are the poo
and more ignorant part of the population. If, however,
take matters which do not fall within the scope of penal la
the general impression of those who have lived long both
Protestant Europe and in America seems to be that as respe
veracity, temperance, the purity of domestic life,[1] tendern
to children and the weak, and general kindliness of behavio
the native Americans stand rather higher than either the E
lish or the Germans.[2] And those whose opinion I am quot
seem generally, though not universally, disposed to think t
the influence of religious belief, which may survive in its eff
upon the character when a man has dropped his connect
with any religious body, counts for a good deal in this, and
a more consciously present and active force than in the t
countries I have referred to.

If we ask how far religion exerts a stimulating influence
the thought and imagination of a nation, we are met by
difficulty of determining what is the condition of mank

[1] The great frequency of divorce in some States — there are spots wh
the proportion of divorces to marriages is 1 to 7 — does not appear to beto
immorality, but to be due to the extreme facility with which the law all
one or both of a married pair to indulge their caprice. Divorce is said to
less frequent in proportion among the middle and upper than among the h
bler classes, and is, speaking generally, more frequent the further West
goes. It is increasing everywhere; but it increases also in those Europ
countries which permit it. I have collected materials for an account of
laws and their working, but am unable to insert that account in the pre
edition.

[2] This can not be said as regards commercial uprightness, in which res
the United States stand certainly on no higher level than England and
many, and possibly below France and Scandinavia.

where no such influence is present. There has never been a civilized nation without a religion; and though many highly civilized individual men live without one, they are so obviously the children of a state of sentiment and thought in which religion has been a powerful factor, that no one can conjecture what a race of men would be like who had during several generations believed themselves to be the highest beings in the universe, or at least entirely out of relation to any other higher being, and to be therewithal destined to no kind of existence after death. Some may hold that respect for public opinion, sympathy, an interest in the future of mankind, would do for such a people what religion has done in the past; or that they might even be, as Lucretius expected, the happier for the extinction of possible supernatural terrors. Others may hold that life would seem narrow and insignificant, and that the wings of imagination would droop, in a universe felt to be void. All that need be here said is that a people with comparatively little around it in the way of historic memories and associations to touch its emotion, a people whose energy is chiefly absorbed in commerce and the development of the material resources of its territory, a people consumed by a feverish activity that gives little opportunity for reflection or for the contemplation of nature, seems most of all to need to have its horizon widened, its sense of awe and mystery touched, by whatever calls it away from the busy world of sight and sound into the stillness of faith and meditation. A perusal of the literature which the ordinary American of the educated farming and working class reads, and a study of the kind of literature which those Americans who are least coloured by European influences produce, lead me to think that the Bible and Christian theology altogether do more in the way of forming the imaginative background to an average American view of the world of man and nature than they do in modern Protestant Europe.

No one is so thoughtless as not to sometimes ask himself what would befall mankind if the solid fabric of belief on which their morality has hitherto rested, or at least been deemed by them to rest, were suddenly to break up and vanish under the influence of new views of nature, as the ice-fields split and melt when they have floated down into a warmer sea. Moral-

ity with religion for its sanction has hitherto been the bas of social polity, except under military despotisms: woul morality be so far weakened as to make social polity unstable and if so, would a reign of violence return? In Europe th question does not seem urgent, because in Europe the physic force of armed men which maintains order is usually conspi uous, and because obedience to authority is everywhere Europe matter of ancient habit, having come down little i paired from ages when men obeyed without asking for reason. But in America, the whole system of governme seems to rest not on armed force, but on the will of the nume cal majority, a majority most of whom might well think th its overthrow would be for them a gain. So sometimes, stan ing in the midst of a great American city, and watching t throngs of eager figures streaming hither and thither, mar ing the sharp contrasts of poverty and wealth, an increasi mass of wretchedness and an increasing display of luxur knowing that before long a hundred millions of men will l living between ocean and ocean under this one governme — a government which their own hands have made, and whic they feel to be the work of their own hands — one is startl by the thought of what might befall this huge yet delica fabric of laws and commerce and social institutions were t foundation it has rested on to crumble away. Suppose th all these men ceased to believe that there was any pow above them, any future before them, anything in heaven earth but what their senses told them of; suppose that the consciousness of individual force and responsibility, alread dwarfed by the overwhelming power of the multitude, a the fatalistic submission it engenders, were further weaken by the feeling that their swiftly fleeting life was rounded a perpetual sleep —

> Soles occidere et redire possunt:
> Nobis, quum semel occidit brevis lux
> Nox est perpetua una dormienda.

Would the moral code stand unshaken, and with it the reve ence for law, the sense of duty towards the community, a even towards the generations yet to come? Would men s "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die"? Or wou

ustom, and sympathy, and a perception of the advantages which table government offers to the citizens as a whole, and which rderly self-restraint offers to each one, replace supernatural anctions, and hold in check the violence of masses and the elf-indulgent impulses of the individual? History, if she annot give a complete answer to this question, tells us that itherto civilized society has rested on religion, and that free overnment has prospered best among religious peoples.

America is no doubt the country in which intellectual move-ents work most swiftly upon the masses, and the country in hich the loss of faith in the invisible might produce the com-letest revolution, because it is the country where men have een least wont to revere anything in the visible world. Yet merica seems as unlikely to drift from her ancient moorings s any country of the Old World. It was religious zeal and he religious conscience which led to the founding of the New ngland colonies two centuries and a half ago — those colonies hose spirit has in such a large measure passed into the whole ation. Religion and conscience have been a constantly active orce in the American commonwealth ever since, not, indeed, rong enough to avert many moral and political evils, yet at he worst times inspiring a minority with a courage and ardour y which moral and political evils have been held at bay, and the long run generally overcome.

It is an old saying that monarchies live by honour and publics by virtue. The more democratic republics become, he more the masses grow conscious of their own power, the ore do they need to live, not only by patriotism, but by rever-nce and self-control, and the more essential to their well-eing are those sources whence reverence and self-control ow.

CHAPTER CVIII

THE POSITION OF WOMEN

It has been well said that the position which women h in a country is, if not a complete test, yet one of the best te of the progress it has made in civilization. When one co pares nomad man with settled man, heathen man with Ch tian man, the ancient world with the modern, the East world with the Western, it is plain that in every case advance in public order, in material comfort, in wealth, decency and refinement of manners, among the whole popu tion of a country — for in these matters one must not l merely at the upper class — has been accompanied by a grea respect for women, by a greater freedom accorded to them, a fuller participation on their part in the best work of world. Americans are fond of pointing, and can with per justice point, to the position their women hold as an evide of the high level their civilization has reached. Certai nothing in the country is more characteristic of the pecu type their civilization has taken.

The subject may be regarded in so many aspects that i convenient to take up each separately.

As respects the legal rights of women, these, of cou depend on the legislative enactments of each State of Union, for in no case has the matter been left under the rig of the common law. With much diversity in minor deta the general principles of the law are in all or nearly all States similar. Women have been placed in an equality w men as respects all private rights. In some States husband wife can sue one another at law. Married as well as unmar women have long since (and I think everywhere) obtained control of their property, whether obtained by gift or desc or by their own labour. This has been deemed so importa point that, instead of being left to ordinary legislation, it

several States been directly enacted by the people in the onstitution. Women have in most, though perhaps not in all, tates rights of guardianship over their children which the law England denied to them till the Act of 1886; and in some tates the mother's rights are equal, where there has been a vol-ntary separation, to those of the father. The law of divorce in many States far from satisfactory, but it always aims at ing equal justice as between husbands and wives. Special otection as respects hours of labour is given to women by the ws of many States, and a good deal of recent legislation has en passed with intent to benefit them, though not always by ell-chosen means.

Women have made their way into most of the professions ore largely than in Europe. In many of the Northern cities ey practise as physicians, and seem to have found little or no ejudice to overcome. Medical schools have been provided r them in some universities. It was less easy to obtain mission to the bar, yet several have secured this, and the mber seems to increase. They mostly devote themselves to e attorney's part of the work rather than to court practice. ne edits, or lately edited, the *Illinois Law Journal* with great ceptance. Several have entered the Christian ministry, though, think, only in what may be called the minor sects, not in any the five or six great denominations, whose spirit is more nservative. Some have obtained success as professional lect-ers, and not a few are journalists. One hears little of them engineering. They are seldom to be seen in the offices of tels, but many, more than in England, are employed as clerks secretaries, both in some of the Government departments, d by telegraphic and other companies, as well as in publish-g houses and other kinds of business where physical strength not needed. Type-writing work is largely in their hands. ey form an overwhelming majority of the teachers in public ools for boys as well as for girls, and are thought to be bet-teachers, at least for the younger sort, than men are.[1] No

[1] The number of teachers in the common schools is given by the United States reau of Education Report for 1889–90 at 125,602 men and 238,333 women. male teachers are in a majority in the Southern States and in Indiana and w Mexico, the preponderance of women in the Northern States generally is y great. It has increased sensibly of late years over the whole country. Massachusetts women teachers are nine times as numerous as men.

class prejudice forbids the daughters of clergymen or lawy
of the best standing to teach in elementary schools. Tak
one thing with another, it is easier for women to find a car
to obtain remunerative work of an intellectual as of a comm
cial or mechanical kind, than in any part of Europe. Popu
sentiment is entirely in favour of giving them every cha
as witness the new Constitutions of several Western Sta
(including Washington, which has refused them the suffra
which expressly provide that they shall be equally admiss
to all professions or employments. In no other country h
women borne so conspicuous a part in the promotion of mo
and philanthropic causes. They were among the earliest, m
zealous, and most effective apostles of the anti-slavery mo
ment. They have taken an equally active share in the tem
ance agitation. Not only has the Women's Christian Tempera
Union with its numerous branches been the most powe
agency directed against the traffic in intoxicants, particula
in the Western States, but individual women have thro
themselves into the struggle with extraordinary zeal. So
years ago, during what was called the women's whiskey w
they forced their way into the drinking saloons, bearded
dealers, adjured the tipplers to come out. At elections in wh
the Prohibitionist issue is prominent, ladies will someti
assemble outside the polls and sing hymns at the voters. T
services in dealing with pauperism, with charities and refor
tory institutions, have been inestimable. In New York s
few years ago, when an Act was needed for improving
administration of the charities, it was a lady (belonging to
of the oldest and most respected families in the country)
went to Albany, and by placing the case forcibly before
State legislature there, succeeded in obtaining the requ
measure. The Charity Organization societies of the g
cities are largely managed by ladies; and the freedom t
enjoy, coupled with a knowledge of business, less freq
among European women, makes them invaluable agents in
work, which the growth of a pauper class renders daily m
important. So too when it became necessary after the wa
find teachers for the negroes in the institutions founded for t
benefit in the South, it was chiefly Northern girls who vo
teered for the duty, and discharged it with single-minded

American women take less part in politics than their English ers do, although more than the women of Germany, France, Italy. That they talk less about politics may be partly ribed to the fact that politics come less into ordinary con- sation in America (except during a presidential election) n in England. But the practice of canvassing at elections, ently developed by English ladies with eminent success, ms unknown. Ladies have never, I think, been chosen mbers of either Republican or Democratic conventions. wever, at the National Convention of the Prohibitionist ty at Pittsburg in 1884 a number of ladies presented creden- s as delegates from local organizations, and were admitted sit. One of the two secretaries of that Convention was oman. Several were placed on the Committee of Creden- s. So women have in some cities, and notably in Phila- phia, borne a useful and influential, albeit comparatively onspicuous part, in the recent movements for the reform of nicipal government. Here we are on the debatable ground ween pure party politics and philanthropic agitation. Women e been so effective in the latter that they cannot easily be luded when persuasion passes into constitutional action, and is not surprised to find the Prohibition party declare in their form of 1884 that "they alone recognize the influence of nan, and offer to her equal rights with man in the manage- t of national affairs." At the recent gatherings in the st which gave expression to the discontent of the farming s, women appeared, and were treated with a deference ch anywhere but in America would have contrasted strangely n the roughness of the crowd. One of them signalized her- by denouncing a proposed banquet, on the ground that it being got up in the interests of the brewers. Presidential lidates have often "receptions" given in their honour by es, and some of the letters which, during the campaign of l, appeared in the newspapers in advocacy of one or other y, bore female signatures. One hears of attempts made to blish political "salons" at Washington, but neither there elsewhere has the influence of social gatherings attained the ortance it has often possessed in France, though occasionally wife of a politician makes his fortune by her tact and skill winning support for him among professional politicians or

the members of a State legislature. There is, however, and
and less auspicious sphere of political action into which wo
have found their way at the national capital. The solicita
of members of a legislature with a view to the passing of
especially private bills, and to the obtaining of places,
become a profession there, and the persuasive assiduity w
had long been recognized by poets as characteristic of
female sex, has made them widely employed and efficien
this work.

I have already, in treating of the woman suffrage m
ment (Chapter XCVI.), referred to the various public o
which have been in many States thrown open to women
is universally admitted that the gift of the suffrage must
with it the right of obtaining any post in the service o
country for which votes are cast, up to and including the
idency itself.

The subject of women's education opens up a large
Want of space obliges me to omit a description, for wh
have accumulated abundant materials, and to confine m
to a few concise remarks.

The public provision for the instruction of girls is qui
ample and adequate as that made for boys. Elementary sc
are of course provided alike for both sexes, grammar sc
and high schools are organized for the reception of girls
times under the same roof or even in the same classes,
times in a distinct building, but always, I think, with an eq
complete staff of teachers and equipment of educationa
pliances. The great majority of the daughters of merca
and professional men, especially of course in the West
ceive their education in these public secondary schools;
what is more remarkable, the number of girls who con
their education in the higher branches, including the an
classics and physical science, up to the age of seventee
eighteen, is as large, in many places larger, than that o
boys, the latter being drafted off into practical life,
the former indulge their more lively interest in the thin
the mind. One often hears it charged as a fault on the A

[1] There are some private boarding schools and many private day
for girls in the Eastern States. Comparatively few children are educa
home by governesses.

n system that its liberal provision of gratuitous instruction in
e advanced subjects tends to raise girls of the humbler classes
t of the sphere to which their pecuniary means would destine
em, makes them discontented with their lot, implants tastes
ich fate will for ever forbid them to gratify.

As stated in a previous chapter (Chapter CV.), University
ucation is provided for women in the Eastern States by
leges expressly erected for their benefit, and in the Western
ates by State universities, whose regulations usually provide
the admission of female equally with male students to a
atuitous instruction in all subjects. There are also some
leges of private foundation which receive young men and
idens together, teaching them in the same classes, but
oviding separate buildings for their lodging.

I must not attempt to set forth and discuss the evidence
garding the working of this system of co-education, in-
esting as the facts are, but be content with stating the
neral result of the inquiries I made.

Co-education answers perfectly in institutions like Antioch
d Oberlin in Ohio, where manners are plain and simple,
ere the students all come from a class in which the inter-
rse of young men and young women is easy and natural,
d where there is a strong religious influence pervading the
of the place. No moral difficulties are found to arise.
ch sex is said to improve the other: the men become more
ned, the women more manly. Now and then students fall
ove with one another, and marry when they have graduated.
why not? Such marriages are based upon a better recipro-
knowledge of character than is usually attainable in the great
ld, and are reported to be almost invariably happy. So also
he Western State universities co-education is well reported
In these establishments the students mostly lodge where
y will in the city, and are therefore brought into social
tions only in the hours of public instruction; but the ten-
cy of late years has been, while leaving men to find their
n quarters, to provide places of residence for the women.
e authorities have little to do in the way of discipline or
ervision, and say they do not find it needed, and that they
not aware of any objections to the system. I did find,
wever, that the youths in some cases expressed aversion to

it, saying they would rather be in classes by themselves; reason apparently being that it was disagreeable to see a n whom men thought meanly of standing high in the favour lady students. In these Western States there is so much fr dom allowed in the intercourse of youths and girls, and g are so well able to take care of themselves, that the objecti which occur to a European arouse no disquietude. Whethe system which has borne good fruits in the primitive society the West is fit to be adopted in the Eastern States, where conditions of life approach nearer to those of Europe, i question warmly debated in America. The need for it is any rate not urgent, because the liberality of founders a benefactors has provided in at least five women's colleges one of them a department of Harvard University — pla where an excellent education, surpassing that of most of Western universities, stands open to women. These colle are at present so efficient and popular, and the life of th students is in some respects so much freer than it could v be, considering the etiquette of Eastern society, in universi frequented by both sexes, that they will probably continue satisfy the practical needs of the community and the wis of all but the advocates of complete theoretical equality.

It will be seen from what has been said that the provis for women's education in the United States is ampler and be than that made in any European countries, and that the mak of it has been far more distinctly recognized as a matter public concern. To these advantages, and to the spirit t proceed from, much of the influence which women exert m be ascribed. They feel more independent, they have a fu consciousness of their place in the world of thought as wel in the world of action. The practice of educating the two se together in the same colleges tends, in those sections of country where it prevails, in the same direction, placing wo and men on a level as regards attainments, and giving th a greater number of common intellectual interests. It d not, I think, operate to make women either pedantic or ma line, or to diminish the differences between their mental moral habits and those of men. Nature is quite strong eno to make the differences of temperament she creates persist even under influences which might seem likely to diminish th

Custom allows to women a greater measure of freedom in ing what they will and going where they please than they ave in any European country, except, perhaps, in Russia. No ne is surprised to see a lady travel alone from the Atlantic to ne Pacific, nor a girl of the richer class walking alone through ne streets of a city. If a lady enters some occupation heretore usually reserved to men, she is subject to much less censous remark than would follow her in Europe, though in this atter the society of Eastern cities is hardly so liberal as that f the West.

Social intercourse between youths and maidens is everywhere ore easy and unrestrained than in England or Germany, not speak of France. Yet, there are considerable differences etween the Eastern cities, whose usages have begun to approxnate to those of Europe, and other parts of the country. In e rural districts, and generally all over the West, young men nd girls are permitted to walk together, drive together, go t to parties, and even to public entertainments together, ithout the presence of any third person, who can be supposed be looking after or taking charge of the girl. So a girl may, she pleases, keep up a correspondence with a young man, r will her parents think of interfering. She will have her vn friends, who, when they call at her house, ask for her, d are received by her, it may be alone; because they are not emed to be necessarily the friends of her parents also, nor en of her sisters. In the cities of the Atlantic States, it is w thought scarcely correct for a young man to take a young dy out for a solitary drive; and in few sets would he be pertted to escort her alone to the theatre. But girls still go thout chaperons to dances, the hostess being deemed to act chaperon for all her guests; and as regards both correspondnce and the right to have one's own circle of acquaintances, e usage even of New York or Boston allows more liberty an does that of London or Edinburgh. It was at one time, d it may possibly still be, not uncommon for a group of young ople who know one another well to make up an autumn arty in the woods." They choose some mountain and forest gion, such as the Adirondack Wilderness west of Lake Chamin, engage three or four guides, embark with guns and fishing ds, tents, blankets, and a stock of groceries, and pass in boats

up the rivers and across the lakes of this wild country throu
sixty or seventy miles of trackless forest to their chosen ca
ing ground at the foot of some tall rock that rises from the s
crystal of the lake. Here they build their bark hut, and spr
their beds of the elastic and fragrant hemlock boughs;
youths roam about during the day, tracking the deer, the g
read and work and bake the corn cakes; at night there i
merry gathering round the fire or a row in the soft moonlig
On these expeditions brothers will take their sisters and cous
who bring perhaps some lady friends with them; the broth
friends will come too; and all will live together in a frate
way for weeks or months, though no elderly relative or marr
lady be of the party.

There can be no doubt that the pleasure of life is sensi
increased by the greater freedom which transatlantic cust
permits; and as the Americans insist that no bad results h
followed, one notes with regret that freedom declines in
places which deem themselves most civilized. American g
have been, so far as a stranger can ascertain, less disposed
what are called "fast ways" than girls of the correspond
classes in England,[1] and exercise in this respect a pretty rig
ous censorship over one another. But when two young peo
find pleasure in one another's company, they can see as m
of each other as they please, can talk and walk together
quently, can show that they are mutually interested, and
need have little fear of being misunderstood either by
another or by the rest of the world. It is all a matte
custom. In the West custom sanctions this easy friendsh
in the Atlantic cities so soon as people have come to find so
thing exceptional in it, constraint is felt, and a conventio
etiquette like that of the Old World begins to replace
innocent simplicity of the older time, the test of whose m
may be gathered from the universal persuasion in Ame
that happy marriages are in the middle and upper ranks m
common than in Europe, and that this is due to the ample
portunities which young men and women have of learning

[1] Between fastness and freedom there is in American eyes all the diffe
in the world, but new-comers from Europe are startled. I remember to
once heard a German lady settled in a Western city characterize Ame
women as "*furchtbar frei und furchtbar fromm*" (frightfully free and fr
fully pious).

other's characters and habits before becoming betrothed. ost girls have a larger range of intimate acquaintances than ls have in Europe, intercourse is franker, there is less differ- e between the manners of home and the manners of general iety. The conclusions of a stranger are in such matters of value, so I can only repeat that I have never met any licious American lady who, however well she knew the Old rld, did not think that the New World customs conduced re both to the pleasantness of life before marriage, and to stancy and concord after it.

In no country are women, and especially young women, so ch made of. The world is at their feet. Society seems anized for the purpose of providing enjoyment for them. rents, uncles, aunts, elderly friends, even brothers, are ready make their comfort and convenience bend to the girls' hes. The wife has fewer opportunities for reigning over world of amusements, because, except among the richest ple, she has more to do in household management than in gland, owing to the scarcity of servants. But she holds in own house a more prominent, if not a more substantially verful, position than in England or even in France. With German *Hausfrau*, who is too often content to be a mere sewife, there is of course no comparison. The best proof he superior place American ladies occupy is to be found in notions they profess to entertain of the relations of an glish married pair. They talk of the English wife as little ter than a slave, declaring that when they stay with English nds, or receive an English couple in America, they see the e always deferring to the husband and the husband always uming that his pleasure and convenience are to prevail. e European wife, they admit, often gets her own way, but gets it by tactful arts, by flattery or wheedling or playing the man's weaknesses; whereas in America the husband's y and desire is to gratify the wife and render to her those vices which the English tyrant exacts from his consort.[1] e may often hear an American matron commiserate a friend

[1] I have heard American ladies say, for instance, that they have observed an Englishman who has forgotten his keys, sends his wife to the top of house to fetch them; whereas an American would do the like errand for vife, and never suffer her to do it for him.

who has married in Europe, while the daughters declar
chorus that they will never follow the example. Laugh
as all this may seem to Englishwomen, it is perfectly true
the theory as well as the practice of conjugal life is not
same in America as in England. There are overbearing
bands in America, but they are more condemned by the opi
of the neighbourhood than in England. There are exa
wives in England, but their husbands are more pitied
would be the case in America. In neither country can
say that the principle of perfect equality reigns, for in Am
the balance inclines nearly though not quite as much in fa
of the wife as it does in England in favour of the husb
No one man can have a sufficiently large acquaintance in
countries to entitle his individual opinion on the resul
much weight. So far as I have been able to collect views
those observers who have lived in both countries, they a
favour of the American practice, perhaps because the th
it is based on departs less from pure equality than does
of England. These observers do not mean that the recogn
of women as equals or superiors makes them any bett
sweeter or wiser than Englishwomen; but rather tha
principle of equality, by correcting the characteristic f
of men, and especially their selfishness and vanity, is
conducive to the concord and happiness of a home. They
ceive that, to make the wife feel her independence and re
sibility more strongly than she does in Europe, tends to
and expand her character, while conjugal affection, us
stronger in her than in the husband, inasmuch as ther
fewer competing interests, saves her from abusing the
dence yielded to her. This seems to be true, but I have
others maintain that the American system, since it doe
require the wife habitually to forego her own wishes, t
if not to make her self-indulgent and capricious, yet sli
to impair the more delicate charms of character; as it is
ten, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

A European cannot spend an evening in an American
ing-room without perceiving that the attitude of men to w
is not that with which he is familiar at home. The av
European man has usually a slight sense of condesce
when he talks to a woman on serious subjects. Even if

s superior in intellect, in character, in social rank, he thinks at as a man he is her superior, and consciously or uncon-ously talks down to her. She is too much accustomed to this resent it, unless it becomes tastelessly palpable. Such a tion does not cross an American's mind. He talks to a man just as he would to a man, of course with more defer-ce of manner, and with a proper regard to the topics likely interest her, but giving her his intellectual best, addressing r as a person whose opinion is understood by both to be rth as much as his own. Similarly an American lady does t expect to have conversation made to her. It is just as ch her duty or pleasure to lead it as the man's is, and more en than not she takes the burden from him, darting along th a gay vivacity which puts to shame his slower wits.

It need hardly be said that in all cases where the two sexes ne into competition for comfort, the provision is made first women. In railroads the end car of the train, being that thest removed from the smoke of the locomotive, is often erved for them (though men accompanying a lady are owed to enter it), and at hotels their sitting-room is the t and sometimes the only available public room, ladyless sts being driven to the bar or the hall. In omnibuses and rse-cars (tram-cars) it was formerly the custom for a gen-man to rise and offer his seat to a lady if there were no ant place. This is now less universally done. In New York l Boston (and I think also in San Francisco), I have seen men keep their seats when ladies entered; and I recollect occasion when the offer of a seat to a lady was declined her, on the ground that as she had chosen to enter a full she ought to take the consequences. It was (I was told in ton) a feeling of this kind that had led to the discontinu-e of the old courtesy. When ladies constantly pressed the already crowded vehicles, the men, who could not re the enforcement of the regulations against overcrowd-tried to protect themselves by refusing to rise. It is etimes said that the privileges yielded to American women e disposed them to claim as a right what was only a cour-, and have told unfavourably upon their manners. I know several instances, besides this one of the horse-cars, which ht seem to support the criticism, but cannot on the whole

think it well founded. The better bred women do not pres
on their sex; and the area of good breeding is always wider
It need hardly be said that the community at large gain
the softening and restraining influence which the rever
for womanhood diffuses. Nothing so quickly incenses
people as any insult offered to a woman. Wife-beating,
indeed any kind of rough violence offered to women, is far
common among the rudest class than it is in England. H
work or work at the pit-mouth of mines is seldom or n
done by women in America; and the American traveller
in some parts of Europe finds women performing se
manual labour is revolted by the sight in a way which E
peans find surprising.

In the farther West, that is to say, beyond the Mississ
in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific States, one is much st
by what seems the absence of the humblest class of wo
The trains are full of poorly dressed and sometimes (th
less frequently) rough-mannered men. One discovers
women whose dress or air marks them out as the wives, da
ters, or sisters of these men, and wonders whether the
population is celibate, and if so, why there are so many wo
Closer observation shows that the wives, daughters, and si
are there, only their attire and manner are those of what E
peans would call middle class and not working class pe
This is partly due to the fact that Western men affect a r
dress. Still one may say that the remark so often made
the masses of the American people correspond to the mi
class of Europe is more true of the women than of the
and is more true of them in the rural districts and in the
than it is of the inhabitants of Atlantic cities. I rememb
have been dawdling in a book-store in a small town in Or
when a lady entered to inquire if a monthly magazine, w
name was unknown to me, had yet arrived. When she
gone I asked the salesman who she was, and what was
periodical she wanted. He answered that she was the wi
a railway workman, that the magazine was a journal of fash
and that the demand for such journals was large and con
among women of the wage-earning class in the town.
set me to observing female dress more closely, and it tu
out to be perfectly true that the women in these little t

re following the Parisian fashions very closely, and were, in t, ahead of the majority of English ladies belonging to the fessional and mercantile classes.[1] Of course in such a town I refer to there are no domestic servants except in the els (indeed, almost the only domestic service to be had in Pacific States was till very recently that of Chinese), so se votaries of fashion did all their own housework and ked after their own babies.

Three causes combine to create among American women an rage of literary taste and influence higher than that of nen in any European country. These are, the educational lities they enjoy, the recognition of the equality of the es in the whole social and intellectual sphere, and the ure which they possess as compared with men. In a coun- where men are incessantly occupied at their business or fession, the function of keeping up the level of culture olves upon women. It is safe in their hands. They are ck and keen-witted, less fond of open-air life and physical rtion than Englishwomen are, and obliged by the climate pass a greater part of their time under shelter from cold of winter and the sun of summer. For music and the pictorial arts they do not yet seem to have formed so ng a taste as for literature, partly perhaps owing to the that in America the opportunities of seeing and hearing terpieces, except indeed operas, are rarer than in Europe. they are eager and assiduous readers of all such books periodicals as do not presuppose special knowledge in e branch of science or learning, while the number who e devoted themselves to some special study and attained iciency in it is large. The fondness for sentiment, espe- y moral and domestic sentiment, which is often observed haracterizing American taste in literature, seems to be nly due to the influence of women, for they form not only larger part of the reading public, but an independent- led part, not disposed to adopt the canons laid down by , and their preferences count for more in the opinions and ilections of the whole nation than is the case in England.

[1] The above, of course, does not apply to the latest immigrants from Europe, are still European in their dress and ways, though in a town they become ly Americanized.

Similarly the number of women who write is infinitely la in America than in Europe. Fiction, essays, and poetry naturally their favourite provinces. In poetry more part larly, many whose names are quite unknown in Europe h attained widespread fame.

Some one may ask how far the differences between the p tion of women in America and their position in Europe due to democracy? or if not to this, then to what other cau

They are due to democratic feeling in so far as they spr from the notion that all men are free and equal, possesse certain inalienable rights, and owing certain correspond duties. This root idea of democracy cannot stop at defi men as male human beings, any more than it could ultima stop at defining them as white human beings. For many y the Americans believed in equality with the pride of discove as well as with the fervour of apostles. Accustomed to ap it to all sorts and conditions of men, they were naturally first to apply it to women also; not, indeed, as respects p tics, but in all the social as well as legal relations of Democracy is in America more respectful of the individ less disposed to infringe his freedom or subject him to sort of legal or family control, than it has shown itsel Continental Europe, and this regard for the individual en to the benefit of women. Of the other causes that h worked in the same direction two may be mentioned. On the usage of the Congregationalist, Presbyterian, and Bap churches, under which a woman who is a member of the gregation has the same rights in choosing a deacon, elde pastor, as a man has. Another is the fact that among westward-moving settlers women were at first few in num and were therefore treated with special respect. The h then formed was retained as the communities grew, and pr gated itself all over the country.

What have been the results on the character and useful of women themselves?

Favourable. They have opened to them a wider life more variety of career. While the special graces of the f nine character do not appear to have suffered, there has produced a sort of independence and a capacity for self- which are increasingly valuable as the number of unmar

omen increases. More resources are open to an American oman who has to lead a solitary life, not merely in the way employment, but for the occupation of her mind and tastes, an to a European spinster or widow; while her education s not rendered the American wife less competent for the scharge of household duties.

How has the nation at large been affected by the develop-ent of this new type of womanhood, or rather perhaps of is variation on the English type?

If women have on the whole gained, it is clear that the tion gains through them. As mothers they mould the char-ter of their children; while the function of forming the bits of society and determining its moral tone rests greatly their hands. But there is reason to think that the influ-ce of the American system tells directly for good upon men well as upon the whole community. Men gain in being ought to treat women as equals rather than as graceful play-ngs or useful drudges. The respect for women which every nerican man either feels or is obliged by public sentiment profess, has a wholesome effect on his conduct and char-er, and serves to check the cynicism which some other culiarities of the country foster. The nation as a whole es to the active benevolence of its women, and their zeal promoting social reforms, benefits which the customs of ntinental Europe would scarcely have permitted women to fer. Europeans have of late years begun to render a well-served admiration to the brightness and vivacity of Ameri-n ladies. Those who know the work they have done and doing in many a noble cause will admire still more their rgy, their courage, their self-devotion. No country seems owe more to its women than America does, nor to owe to m so much of what is best in social institutions and in the iefs that govern conduct.

CHAPTER CIX

EQUALITY

The United States are deemed all the world over to be p
eminently the land of equality. This was the first feat
which struck Europeans when they began, after the peace
1815 had left them time to look beyond the Atlantic, to f
curious about the phenomena of a new society. This was
great theme of Tocqueville's description, and the starti
point of his speculations; this has been the most const
boast of the Americans themselves, who have believed th
liberty more complete than that of any other people, beca
equality has been more fully blended with it. Yet some p
losophers say that equality is impossible, and others, who
press themselves more precisely, insist that distinctions
rank are so inevitable, that however you try to expunge the
they are sure to reappear. Before we discuss this questi
let us see in what senses the word is used.

First there is legal equality, including both what one m
call passive or private equality, *i.e.* the equal possession
civil private rights by all inhabitants, and active or pul
equality, the equal possession by all of rights to a share
the government, such as the electoral franchise and el
bility to public office. Both kinds of political equality ex
in America, in the amplest measure, and may be dismis
from the present discussion.

Next there is the equality of material conditions, that is
wealth, and all that wealth gives; there is the equality of e
cation and intelligence; there is the equality of social sta
or rank; and there is (what comes near to, but is not exac
the same as, this last) the equality of estimation, *i.e.* of
value which men set upon one another, whatever be the
ments that come into this value, whether wealth, or educati

official rank, or social rank, or any other species of excel-
nce. In how many and which of these senses of the word
es equality exist in the United States?

Clearly not as regards material conditions. Sixty years ago
ere were no great fortunes in America, few large fortunes,
poverty. Now there is some poverty (though only in a
w places can it be called pauperism), many large fortunes,
d a greater number of gigantic fortunes than in any other
untry of the world. The class of persons who are passably
ll off but not rich, a class corresponding in point of income
the lower middle class of England or France, but superior
manners, is much larger than in the great countries of
rope. Between the houses, the dress, and the way of life
these persons, and those of the richer sort, there is less
ference than in Europe. The very rich do not (except in
few places) make an ostentatious display of their wealth,
cause they have no means of doing so, and a visitor is
erefore apt to overrate the extent to which equality of
alth, and of material conditions generally, still prevails.
e most remarkable phenomenon of the last twenty-five years
s been the appearance, not only of those few colossal mil-
naires who fill the public eye, but of many millionaires of
second order, men with fortunes ranging from $5,000,000
$15,000,000. At a seaside resort like Newport, where one
s the finished luxury of the villas, and counts the well-
pointed equipages, with their superb horses, which turn out
the afternoon, one gets some impression of the vast and
wing wealth of the Eastern cities. But through the coun-
generally there is little to mark out the man with an
ome of £20,000 a year from the man of £1000, as he is
rked out in England by his country house with its park,
in France by the opportunities for display which Paris
rds. The number of these fortunes seems likely to go on
reasing, for they are due not merely to the sudden devel-
nent of the West, with the chances of making vast sums by
d speculation or in railway construction, but to the field
doing business on a great scale, which the size of the coun-
presents. Where a merchant or manufacturer in France
England could realize thousands, an American, operating
re boldly, and on this far wider theatre, may realize tens

of thousands. We may therefore except these inequali of wealth to grow; nor will even the habit of equal divis among children keep them down, for families are often sm and though some of those who inherit wealth may renou business, others will pursue it, since the attractions of ot kinds of life are fewer than in Europe. Politics are less in esting, there is no great land-holding class with the du towards tenants and neighbours which an English squire m if he pleases, usefully discharge; the pursuit of collect pictures or other objects of curiosity implies frequent vi to Europe, and although the killing of birds prevails in Middle States and the killing of deer in the West, this rat barbarous form of pleasure is likely in time to die out fro civilized people. Other kinds of what is called "sport" doubt remain, such as horse-racing, eagerly pursued in form of trotting matches,[1] and the manlier amusements yacht-racing, rowing, and base-ball, but these can only followed during part of the year, and some of them only the young. To lead a life of so-called pleasure gives m more trouble in an American city than it does in Paris Vienna or London. Accordingly, while many great fortu will continue to be made, they will be less easily and quic spent than in Europe, and one may surmise that the equa of material conditions, almost universal in last century, s general sixty years ago, will more and more diminish by growth of a very rich class at one end of the line, and very poor class at the other end.[2]

As respects education, the profusion of superior as well elementary schools tends to raise the mass to a somew higher point than in Europe, while the stimulus of life be keener and the habit of reading more general, the numbe persons one finds on the same general level of brightn keenness, and a superficially competent knowledge of com facts, whether in science, history, geography, or literat is extremely large. This general level tends to rise. But

[1] The trotting horse is driven, not ridden, a return to the earliest for horse-racing we know of.

[2] How far inequality of material conditions, as contrasted with pol equality, is likely to prove a source of political danger is a question disc in other chapters. Hitherto it has not proved serious. Cf. Aristotle, V., 1, 2.

evel of exceptional attainment in that small but increasing lass who have studied at the best native universities or in Europe, and who pursue learning and science either as a pro-ession or as a source of pleasure, rises faster than does the eneral level of the multitude, so that in this regard also it ppears that equality has diminished and will diminish urther.

So far we have been on comparatively smooth and easy round. Equality of wealth is a concrete thing; equality of ntellectual possession and resource is a thing which can be erceived and gauged. Of social equality, of distinctions of anding and estimation in private life, it is far more difficult o speak, and in what follows I speak with some hesitation.

One thing, and perhaps one thing only, may be asserted with onfidence. There is no rank in America, that is to say, no xternal and recognized stamp, marking one man as entitled to ny social privileges, or to deference and respect from others. o man is entitled to think himself better than his fellows, or expect any exceptional consideration to be shown by them him. There is no such thing as a recognized order of prece-ence, either on public occasions or at a private party, except hat yielded to a few official persons, such as the governor and hief judges of a State within that State, as well as to the resident and Vice-President, the Speaker of the House, the ederal senators, the judges of the Supreme Federal Court, nd the members of the President's cabinet everywhere through e Union. In fact, the idea of a regular "rule of precedence" spleases the Americans,[1] and one finds them slow to believe hat the existence of such a rule in England entitling the outhful daughter of a baronet, for instance, to go first out of e room at a dinner party on the host's arm, although there ay be present married ladies both older and of some per-nal distinction, is not felt as a mortification by the latter dies, because it is a mere matter of convention and usage hich does not prevent the other guests from respecting these ves of ordinary commoners much more than they may re-

[1] In private parties, so far as there is any rule of precedence, it is that of e, with a tendency to make an exception in favour of clergymen or of any rson of special eminence. It is only in Washington, where senators, judges, nisters, and congressmen are sensitive on these points, that such questions m to arise, or to be regarded as deserving the attention of a rational mind.

spect the baronet's daughter. That an obscure earl shou take precedence of a great poet, or of a prime minister wh happens to be a commoner, shocks Americans out of measure

What then is the effect or influence for social purposes such distinctions as do exist between men, distinctions birth, of wealth, of official position, of intellectual eminenc

To be sprung from an ancient stock, or from a stock whi can count persons of eminence among its ancestors, is course a satisfaction to the man himself. There is at prese almost a passion among Americans for genealogical researche A good many families can trace themselves back to Engli families of the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and of cou a great many more profess to do so. For a man's ancestors have come over in the *Mayflower* is in America much what the having come over with William the Conqueror used to be England, and is often claimed on equally flimsy ground The descendants of any of the revolutionary heroes, such John Adams, Edmund Randolph, Alexander Hamilton, a the descendants of any famous man of colonial times, such the early governors of Massachusetts from William Endic downwards, or of Jonathan Edwards, or of Eliot, the apos of the Indians, are regarded by their neighbours with a certa amount of interest, and their legitimate pride in such ancestry excites no disapproval.[1] In the Eastern cities, a at watering-places like Newport, one begins to see carriag with armorial bearings on their panels, but most people a pear to disapprove or ridicule this as a piece of Angloman more likely to be practised by a *parvenu* than by the scion a really old family. Virginians used to set much store their pedigrees, and the letters F.F.V. (First Families of V ginia) had become a sort of jest against persons pluming the selves on their social position in the Old Dominion.[2] Sir

[1] In all the cases mentioned in the text I remember to have been told others, but never by the persons concerned, of the ancestry. This is an il tration of the fact that while such ancestry is felt to be a distinction it wo be thought bad taste for those who possess it to mention it unless a neces arose for them to do so.

[2] An anecdote is told of the captain of a steamer plying at a ferry fr Maryland into Virginia, who being asked by a needy Virginian to give hi free passage across, inquired if the applicant belonged to one of the F.F "No," answered the man, "I can't exactly say that; rather to one of

he war, however, which has shattered old Virginian society rom its foundations, one hears little of such pretensions.[1]

The fault which Americans are most frequently accused of s the worship of wealth. The amazing fuss which is made bout very rich men, the descriptions of their doings, the peculation as to their intentions, the gossip about their private fe, lend colour to the reproach. He who builds up a huge ortune, especially if he does it suddenly, is no doubt a sort f hero, because an enormous number of men have the same mbition. Having done best what millions are trying to do, e is discussed, admired, and envied in the same way as the aptain of a cricket eleven is at a large school, or the stroke of ne university boat at Oxford or Cambridge. If he be a great nancier, or the owner of a great railroad or a great newspaper, e exercises vast power, and is therefore well worth courting y those who desire his help or would avert his enmity. dmitting all this, it may seem a paradox to observe that a illionaire has a better and easier social career open to him in ngland than in America. Nevertheless there is a sense in hich this is true. In America, if his private character be ad, if he be mean, or openly immoral, or personally vulgar, or shonest, the best society will keep its doors closed against im. In England great wealth, skilfully employed, will more adily force these doors to open. For in England great wealth an, by using the appropriate methods, practically buy rank om those who bestow it; or by obliging persons whose posi- on enables them to command fashionable society, can induce em to stand sponsors for the upstart, and force him into ciety, a thing which no person in America has the power of ing. To effect such a stroke in England the rich man must course have stopped short of positive frauds, that is, of such auds as could be proved in court. But he may be still dis- usted and disliked by the *élite* of the commercial world, he ay be vulgar and ill-educated, and indeed have nothing to commend him except his wealth and his willingness to spend

ond families." "Jump on board," said the captain; "I never met one of ur sort before."

A few years ago a club was formed in New York to include only persons o could prove that their progenitors were settled in the State before the volution, and I daresay clubs exist elsewhere making similar claims to lusiveness.

it in providing amusement for fashionable people. All t
will not prevent him from becoming a baronet, or possibl
peer, and thereby acquiring a position of assured dignity wh
he can transmit to his offspring. The existence of a systen
artificial rank enables a stamp to be given to base metal
Europe which cannot be given in a thoroughly republic
country.[1] The feeling of the American public towards
very rich is, so far as a stranger can judge, one of curiosity a
wonder rather than of respect. There is less snobbishn
shown towards them than in England. They are admired
a famous runner or a jockey is admired, but do not seem
receive either flattery or social deference. When a man
won great wealth by the display of remarkable talents, as
the case with some of the manufacturers and railroad kin
the case is rather different, for it is felt that his gifts ar
credit to the nation.

The persons to whom official rank gives importance are v
few indeed, being for the nation at large only about one h
dred persons at the top of the Federal Government, and
each State less than a dozen of its highest State functionari
For these State functionaries, indeed, the respect shown
extremely scanty, and much more official than personal.
high Federal officer, a senator, or justice of the Supreme cou
or cabinet minister, is conspicuous while he holds his pla
and is of course a personage in any private society he n
enter; but less so than a corresponding official would be
Europe. A simple member of the House of Representative
nobody. Even men of the highest official rank do not g
themselves airs on the score of their position. Once, in Wa
ington, I was taken by a friend to be presented to the Co
mander-in-chief of the United States army, a great sold
whose fame all the world knows. We found him standing
a desk in a bare room in the War Department, at work w
one clerk. While he was talking to us the door of the ro
was pushed open, and there appeared the figure of a West

[1] The English system of hereditary titles tends to maintain the distinc
of ancient lineage far less perfectly than that simple use of a family n
which prevailed in Italy during the Middle Ages, or in ancient Rome
Colonna or a Doria like a Cornelius or a Valerius, carried the glory of
nobility in his name, where any upstart may be created a duke.

urist belonging to what Europeans would call the lower iddle class, followed by his wife and sister, who were "doing" Vashington. Perceiving that the room was occupied they egan to retreat, but the Commander-in-chief called them back. Walk in, ladies," he said. "You can look around. You on't disturb me; make yourselves at home."

Intellectual attainment does not excite much notice till it ecomes eminent, that is to say, till it either places its possessor a conspicuous position, such as that of president of one of ie greatest universities, or till it has made him well known to ie world as a preacher, or writer, or scientific discoverer. Vhen this kind of eminence has been reached, it receives, I ink, more respect than anywhere in Europe, except possibly Italy, where the interest in learned men, or poets, or artists, ems to be greater than anywhere else in Europe.[1] A famous riter or divine is known by name to a far greater number of ersons in America than would know a similar person in any uropean country. He is one of the glories of the country. here is no artificial rank to cast him into the shade. He is ossibly less famous than the railroad kings or manipulators the stock markets; but he excites a different kind of senti- ent; and people are willing to honour him in a way, some- nes distasteful to himself, which could not be applied to the illionaire except by those who sought to gain something from m.

Perhaps the best way of explaining how some of the differ- ces above mentioned, in wealth or official position or intel- ctual eminence, affect social equality is by reverting to what as called, a few pages back, equality of estimation — the ea which men form of other men as compared with them- lves. It is in this that the real sense of equality comes out. America men hold others to be at bottom exactly the same themselves.[2] If a man is enormously rich, like A. T. Stewart William H. Vanderbilt, or if he is a great orator, like Daniel

In Germany great respect is no doubt felt for the leaders of learning and ence; but they are regarded as belonging to a world of their own, separated a wide gulf from the territorial aristocracy, which still deems itself (as in days of Candide's brother-in-law) a different form of mankind from those o have not sixteen quarterings to show.

Some one has said that there are in America two classes only, those who e succeeded and those who have failed.

Webster or Henry Ward Beecher, or a great soldier like Ulys S. Grant, or a great writer like R. W. Emerson, or Preside so much the better for him. He is an object of interest, p haps of admiration, possibly even of reverence. But he deemed to be still of the same flesh and blood as other m The admiration felt for him may be a reason for going to him and longing to shake hands with him. But it is no reason for bowing down to him, or addressing him in defe tial terms, or treating him as if he were porcelain and your only earthenware.[1] In this respect there is, I think, a dif ence, slight but perceptible, between the sentiment of equa as it exists in the United States, and as one finds it in Fra and Switzerland, the countries of the Old World where (if except Norway, which has never had an aristocracy) so equality has made the greatest progress. In France Switzerland there lingers a kind of feeling as if the old *nobl* were not quite like other men. The Swiss peasant, with his manly independence, has in many cantons a touch instinctive reverence for the old families; or perhaps, in s other cantons, a touch of jealousy which makes him desir exclude their members from office, because he feels that t still think themselves better than he is. Nothing like thi possible in America, where the very notion of such distinct excites a wondering curiosity as to what sort of creature titled noble of Europe can be.

The total absence of rank and the universal acceptanc equality do not however prevent the existence of grades distinctions in society which, though they may find no tang expression, are sometimes as sharply drawn as in Eur Except in the newer parts of the West, those who deem th selves ladies and gentlemen draw just the same line betw themselves and the multitude as is drawn in England, and d it in much the same way. The nature of a man's occupat

[1] This is seen even in the manner of American servants. Although the an aversion among native Americans to enter domestic service, the tempo discharge of such duties does not necessarily involve any loss of caste. than twenty years ago I remember to have found all the waiting in a hotel in the White Mountains done by the daughters of respectable New land farmers in the low country who had come up for their summer chan air to this place of resort, and were earning their board and lodging by a as waitresses. They were treated by the guests as equals, and were in cultivated and well-mannered young women.

s education, his manners and breeding, his income, his con-ections, all come into view in determining whether he is in is narrow sense of the word "a gentleman," almost as they ould in England,[1] though in most parts of the United States rsonal qualities count for rather more than in England, and cupation for rather less. The word is equally indefinable in th countries, but in America the expression "not quite a dy" seems to be less frequently employed. One is told, wever, that the son of cultivated parents would not like to ter a retail store: and even in a Western city like Detroit e best people will say of a party that it was "very mixed." some of the older cities society is as exclusive as in the re old-fashioned English counties, the "best set" consider-g itself very select indeed. In such a city I remember to ve heard a family belonging to the best set, which is mostly be found in a particular quarter of the city, speak of the habitants of a handsome suburb two miles away just as lgravians might speak of Islington; and the son of the mily who, having made in Europe the acquaintance of some the dwellers in this suburb, had gone to a ball there, was estioned by his sisters about their manners and customs much if he had returned from visiting a tribe in Central Africa. inquiry I discovered that these North Shore people were as h and doubtless thought themselves as cultivated as the peo-e of my friend's quarter. But all the city knew that the ter were the "best set." One hears that this exclusiveness reads steadily from East to West, and that before long there ll be such sets in all the greater cities.

Europeans have been known to ask whether the United ates do not suffer from the absence of a hereditary nobility. may be supposed, such a question excites mirth in America; is as if you were to offer them a Court and an Established urch. They remark, with truth, that since Pitt in England l the Napoleons in France prostituted hereditary titles, these ve ceased to be either respectable or useful. "They do not,"

[1] On the New York elevated railroad smoking is not permitted in any car. en I asked a conductor how he was able to enforce this rule, considering t on every other railway smoking was practised, he answered, "I always when any one seems disposed to insist, 'Sir, I am sure that if you are a tleman you will not wish to bring me into a difficulty,' and then they always ve off."

say the Americans, "suggest antiquity, for the English fam
that enjoy them are mostly new; they are not associated,
the ancient titles, with the history of your nation; they
merely a prize offered to wealth, the expression of a desir
gilding that plutocracy which has replaced the ancient
tocracy of your country. Seeing how little service heredi
nobility renders in maintaining the standard either of man
or morals,[1] or honour, or public duty, few sensible men w
create it in any European country where it did not exist; r
less then should we dream of creating it in America, w
possesses none of the materials or conditions which could r
it tolerable. If a peerage is purchaseable even in Engl
where the dignity of the older nobility might have sugge
some care in bestowal, purchaseable not so openly as in P
gal or a German principality, but practically purchaseabl
party services and by large subscriptions to public purp
much more would it be purchaseable here, where there a
traditions to break down, where wealth accumulates rap
and the wealthy seek every avenue for display. Titles in
country would be simply an additional prize offered to w
and ambition. They could not be respected. They w
make us as snobbish as you are. They would be an unm
evil." A European observer will not quarrel with this
ment. There is already a disposition in America, as e
where else, to relish and make the most of such profess
or official titles as can be had; it is a harmless way of t
to relieve the monotony of the world. If there be, as no d
there is, less disposition than in England to run after and
court to the great or the fashionable, this is perhaps due n
any superior virtue, but to the absence of those opportun
and temptations which their hereditary titles and other s
institutions set before the English. It would be the
wantonness of folly to create in the new country what
thinking people would gladly be rid of in the old one.

Another question is more serious and less easily answ
What is the effect of social equality upon manners? I

[1] The moral and social standard which American society enforces is in
respects more exacting than that of England. I have frequently heard A
cans express surprise at the reception accorded by fashionable Lon
Americans whom they held cheap, or to persons, whether English or fo
whose transgressions had become matter of notoriety.

ses go to the making of manners, as one may see by noting
v much better they are in some parts of Europe than
other parts where, nevertheless, the structure of society is
ally aristocratic, or democratic, as the case may be.[1] One
st therefore be careful not to ascribe to this source only
h peculiarities as America shows. On the whole, bearing
nind that the English race has less than some other races
that quickness of perception and sympathy which goes far
nake manners good, the Americans have gained more than
y have lost by equality. I do not think that the upper
s loses in grace, I am sure that the humbler class gains in
ependence. The manners of the "best people" are exactly
se of England, with a thought more of consideration
ards inferiors and of frankness towards equals. Among
masses there is, generally speaking, as much real courtesy
good nature as anywhere else in the world.[2] There is less
ward politeness than in some parts of Europe, Portugal for
ance, or Tuscany, or Sweden. There is a certain coolness
off-handness which at first annoys the European visitor,
o still thinks himself "a superior"; but when he perceives
t it is not meant for insolence, and that native Americans
not notice it, he learns to acquiesce. Perhaps the worst
ners are those of persons dressed in some rag of authority.
railroad car-conductor has a bad name; but personally I
e always been well treated by him, and remember with
sure one on a Southern railroad (an ex-Confederate sol-
) who did the honours of his car with a dignified courtesy
thy of those Hungarian nobles who are said to have the
manners in Europe. The hotel clerk is supercilious, but
ne frankly admits his superiority, his patronage becomes
ndly, and he may even condescend to interest himself in
ing your stay in the city agreeable. One finds most cour-

t was an old reproach in Europe against republics that their citizens rude: witness the phrases, "manières d'un Suisse," "civilisé en Hol-" (Roscher, *Politik*, p. 314).

There are parts of the West which still lack polish; and the behaviour of hites to the Chinese often incenses a stranger from the Atlantic States rope. I remember in Oregon to have seen a huge navvy turn an inoffen-Chinaman out of his seat in a railway car, and when I went to the con-r and tried to induce him to interfere, he calmly remarked, "Yes, I know things do make the English mad." On the other hand, on the Pacific coloured people often sit down to table with whites.

tesy among the rural population of New England and the
dle States, least among the recent immigrants in the cities
the unsettled population of the West. However, the most r
rial point to remark is the improvement of recent years.
concurrent testimony of European travellers, including
admirers and detractors of democracy, proves that mar
must have been disagreeable fifty years ago, and one
nowadays an equally general admission that the American
as pleasant to one another and to strangers as are the Fr
or the Germans or the English. The least agreeable fea
to the visitors of former years, an incessant vaunting of
own country and disparagement of others, has disappe
and the tinge of self-assertion which the sense of equ
used to give is now but faintly noticeable.

CHAPTER CX

THE INFLUENCE OF DEMOCRACY ON THOUGHT

Two opposite theories regarding the influence of democratic itutions on intellectual activity have found currency. One ory extols them because they stimulate the mind of a ple, not only sharpening men's wits by continual struggle unrest, but giving to each citizen a sense of his own vers and duties in the world, which spurs him on to exer- is in ever-widening fields. This theory is commonly lied to Athens and other democracies of the ancient world, contrasted with Sparta and the oligarchic cities, whose llectual production was scanty or altogether wanting. It pares the Rome of Cicero, Lucretius, and Catullus, and Augustan age, whose great figures were born under the ublic, with the vaster but comparatively sterile Roman ld of Marcus Aurelius or Constantine, when freedom had ; since vanished. It notes the outburst of literary and stic splendour that fell in the later age of the republics of iæval Italy, and dwells with especial pleasure on the evements of Florence, the longest-lived and the most glo- s of the free commonwealths of Italy.

ccording to the other theory, Democracy is the child of rance, the parent of dulness and conceit. The opinion of greatest number being the universal standard, everything educed to the level of vulgar minds. Originality is stunted, ety disappears, no man thinks for himself, or, if he does, s to express what he thinks. A drear pall of monotony rs the sky.

> "Thy hand, great Anarch, lets the curtain fall
> And universal darkness buries all."

his doctrine seems to date from the appearance of Tocque- 's book, though his professed disciples have pushed it

much further than his words warrant. It is really an *a pr* doctrine, drawn from imagining what the consequences c complete equality of material conditions and political pov ought to be. But it claims to rest upon the observed phen ena of the United States, which, thirty years ago, were s the only great modern democracy; and it was with refere to the United States that it was enunciated by Mr. Rol Lowe in one of those speeches of 1866 which so greatly pressed his contemporaries.

Both these theories will be found on examination to be b less. Both, so far as they are *a priori* theories, are fanci both, in so far as they purport to rest upon the facts of hist err by regarding one set of facts only, and ignoring a g number of concomitant conditions which have probably n to do with the result than the few conditions which have b arbitrarily taken to be sufficient causes. None of the Gr republics was a democracy in the modern sense, for all re upon slavery; nor, indeed, can the name be applied, excep passing moments, to any of the Italian cities. Many circ stances besides their popular government combined to p the imperishable crown of literary and artistic glory upon brows of the city of the Violet and the city of the Lily. also the view that a democratic land is necessarily a lan barren monotony, while unsound even as a deduction f general principles, is still more unsound in its assumptio certain phenomena as true of America, and in the face it on the phenomena it has assumed. The theorists who l propounded it give us, like Daniel, the dream as well as t interpretation of it. But the dream is one of their own venting; and such as it is, it is wrongly interpreted.

It is a common mistake to exaggerate the influence of fo of government. As there are historians and politicians w when they come across a trait of national character for w no obvious explanation presents itself, set it down to "ra so there are writers and speakers who, too indolent to ex ine the whole facts of the case, or too ill-trained to feel need of such examination, pounce upon the political ins tions of a country as the easiest way to account for its so and intellectual, perhaps even for its moral and religious, p liarities. Few problems are in reality more complex than

ation between the political and the intellectual life of a untry; few things more difficult to distinguish than the luences respectively attributable to an equality of political hts and powers on the one hand, and an equality of material d social conditions on the other. It is commonly assumed at Democracy and Equality go hand in hand, but as one may ve popular government along with enormous differences of alth and dissimilarities in social usage, so also one may ve social equality under a despot. Doubtless, when social d political equality go hand in hand they intensify one other; but when inequality of material conditions becomes rked, social life changes, and as social phenomena become re complex their analysis becomes more difficult.

Reverting to the two theories from which we set out, it may said that the United States furnish little support to either. nerican democracy has certainly produced no age of Peris. Neither has it dwarfed literature and led a wretched ople, so dull as not even to realize their dulness, into a rren plain of featureless mediocrity. To ascribe the defincies, such as they are, of art and culture in America, solely even mainly to her form of government, is not less absurd n to ascribe, as many Americans of what I may call the mpeting school do, her marvellous material progress to the ne cause. It is not Democracy that has paid off a gigan- debt and raised Chicago out of a swamp. Neither is it mocracy that has hitherto denied the United States philosers like Burke and poets like Wordsworth.

Most writers who have dealt with these matters have not y laid more upon the shoulders of democratic government n it ought to bear, but have preferred abstract speculations the humbler task of ascertaining and weighing the facts. ey have spun ingenious theories about democracy as the rce of this or that, or whatever it pleased them to assume; y have not tried to determine by a wide induction what cific results appear in countries which, differing in other pects, agree in being democratically governed. If I do not ow these time-honoured precedents, it is not because the cess is difficult, but because it is unprofitable. These culations have perhaps had their use in suggesting to us at phenomena we ought to look for in democratic countries;

but if any positive results are to be reached, they must reached by carefully verifying the intellectual phenomena more than one country, and establishing an unmistaka relation between them and the political institutions un which they prevail.

If some one, starting from the current conception of dem cracy, were to say that in a democratic nation we should fin disposition to bold and unbridled speculations, sparing neit theology nor morals, a total absence of rule, tradition, and p cedent, each man thinking and writing as responsible to criticism, "every poet his own Aristotle," a taste for stro effects and garish colours, valuing force rather than finene grandeur rather than beauty, a vigorous, hasty, impetu style of speaking and writing, a grandiose, and perhaps s sational art: he would say what would be quite as natural a reasonable *a priori* as most of the pictures given us of dem cratic societies. Yet many of the suggested features would the opposite of those which America presents.

Every such picture must be fanciful. He who starts from simple and (so to speak) bare a conception as that of eq civil rights and equal political powers vested in every mem of the community cannot but have recourse to his fancy trying to body forth the results of this principle. Let a one study the portrait of the democratic man and democra city which the first and greatest of all the hostile critics democracy has left us,[1] and compare it with the very differ descriptions, of life and culture under a popular governm in which European speculation has disported itself si Tocqueville's time. He will find each theory plausible the abstract, and each equally unlike the facts which cont porary America sets before us.

Let us then bid farewell to fancy and endeavour to cover what are now the salient intellectual features of mass of the native population in the United States.

As there is much difference of opinion regarding ther present with diffidence the following list: —

[1] Plato indeed indulges his fancy so far as to describe the very mules asses of a democracy as prancing along the roads, scarcely deigning to their burdens. The passion for unrestrained licence, for novelty, for var is to him the note of democracy, whereas monotony and even obstinate servatism are the faults which the latest European critics bid us expect.

1. A desire to be abreast of the best thought and work of e world everywhere, to have every form of literature and t adequately represented, and excellent of its kind, so that nerica shall be felt to hold her own among the nations.
2. A fondness for bold and striking effects, a preference r large generalizations and theories which have an air of mpleteness.
3. An absence among the multitude of refined taste, with a sposition to be attracted rather by brilliance than by deli- cy of workmanship; a want of mellowness and inadequate rception of the difference between first-rate work in a quiet yle and mere flatness.
4. Little respect for canons or traditions, accompanied by e notion that new conditions must of necessity produce new eas.
5. An undervaluing of special knowledge or experience, ex- pt in applied science and in commerce, an idea that an able an can do one thing pretty much as well as another, as Dr. hnson thought that if he had taken to politics he would ve been as distinguished therein as he was in tragic poetry.
6. An admiration for literary or scientific eminence, an thusiasm for anything that can be called genius, with an er-readiness to discover it.
7. A love of intellectual novelties.
8. An intellectual impatience, and desire for quick and tent results.
9. An over-valuing of the judgments of the multitude; a sposition to judge by newspaper "success" work which has t been produced with a view to such success.
10. A tendency to mistake bigness for greatness.

Contrariwise, if we regard not the people generally but the ost cultivated class, we shall find, together with a few of e above-mentioned qualities, others which indicate a reac- n against the popular tendencies. This class has a strong ish for subtlety of thought and highly finished art, whether literature or painting. It is so much afraid of crudity and gueness as to be prone to devote itself to minute and care- study of subjects unattractive to the masses.

Of these characteristics of the people at large some may at st sight seem inconsistent with others, as for instance the

admiration for intellectual gifts with the undervaluing special knowledge; nevertheless it could be shown that bo are discoverable in Americans as compared with Englishm The former admire intelligence more than the latter do; they defer less to special competence. However, assumi for the moment that there is something true in these sugg tions, which it would take too long to attempt to establish by one, be it observed that very few of them can be direc connected with democratic government. Even these might take a different form in a differently situated de cracy. The seventh and eighth seem due to the general int ligence and education of the people, while the remaind though not wholly uninfluenced by the habits which popu government tends to breed, must be mainly ascribed to vast size of the country, the vast numbers and intellect homogeneity of its native white population, the prevalence social equality, a busy industrialism, a restless changefuln of occupation, and the absence of a leisured class dominant matters of taste — conditions that have little or nothing to with political institutions. The prevalence of evangeli Protestantism has been quite as important a factor in intellectual life of the nation as its form of government.

Some one may say — I wish to state the view fairly thou I do not entirely agree with it — that assuming the forego analysis to be correct, the influence of democracy, apart fr its tendency to secure an ample provision of education, is cernible in two points. It produces self-confidence and s complacency, national and personal, with the result both stimulating a certain amount of thought and of preventing thought that is so produced from being subjected to pro tests. Ambition and self-esteem will call out what mi have lain dormant, but they will hinder a nation as well a man from duly judging its own work, and in so far will ret its progress. Those who are naturally led to trust and o common sense and the numerical majority in matters of st overvalue the judgment of the majority in other matt Now the judgment of the masses is a poor standard for thinker or the artist to set before him. It may narrow view and debase his style. He fears to tread in new path express unpopular opinions; or if he despises the multit

may take refuge in an acrid cynicism. Where the masses
le, a writer cannot but think of the masses, and as they do
t appreciate refinements he will eschew these, making him-
lf at all hazards intelligible to the common mind, and seek-
g to attract by broad, perhaps coarsely broad, effects, the
sty reader, who leaves Walter Scott or Thackeray unread to
sten on the latest sketch of fashionable life or mysterious
ime.

I do not deny that there is some force in this way of put-
ng the case. Democracy tends to produce a superficially
tive public, and perhaps also a jubilant and self-confident
blic. But it is quite possible to have a democratic people
hich shall be neither fond of letters nor disposed to trust its
n judgment and taste in judging them. Much will depend
the other features of the situation. In the United States
e cultivated public increases rapidly, and the very reaction
hich goes on within it against the defects of the multitude
comes an important factor. All things considered, I doubt
hether democracy tends to discourage originality, subtlety,
inement, in thought and in expression, whether literary or
istic. I doubt if there be any solid ground for expecting
notony or vulgarity under one form of government more
an another. The causes lie deeper. Art and literature
ve before now been base and vulgar under absolute mon-
hies and under oligarchies. One of the most polished and
stocratic societies in Europe has for two centuries been that
Vienna; yet what society could have been intellectually
ller or less productive? Venice was almost the only famous
lian city that contributed nothing to the literature of the
ddle Ages and the Renaissance. Moreover, it must not
forgotten that the habits of popular government which
en a career to talent in public life, open it in literature also.
man need lean on a faction or propitiate a coterie. A pure
ar voice with an unwonted message may at first fail to
ke itself heard over the din of competitors for popular
our; but once heard, it and its message will probably be
ged on their own merits.

Passing away from this question as to the supposed narcotic
ver of democracy, the further question may be asked, What
he distinctive note of democratic thought and art as they

actually appear in the United States? What is the peculi
quality or flavour which springs from this political eleme
in their condition? I cannot tell. I find no such note.
have searched for it, and, as the Americans say, it is ha
work looking for what is not there. Some Europeans a
many Americans profess to have found it, and will tell y
that this or that peculiarity of American literature is due
democracy. No doubt, if you take individual writers, y
may discover in several of them something, though not alwa
the same thing, which savours of democratic feeling and ting
their way of regarding human life. But that is not enoug
What must be shown is a general quality running through t
majority of these writers — a quality which is at once reco
nized as racy of the soil, and which can be traced back to t
democratic element which the soil undoubtedly contains.
such quality seems to have been shown. That there is
distinctive note in many — not, perhaps, in all — of the be
American books may be admitted. It may be caught by ea
not the most delicate. But is this note the voice of democrac
Is it even the voice of democracy and equality combine
There is a difference, slight yet perceptible, in the part whi
both sentiment and humour play in American books, wh
we compare them with English books of equivalent strengt
The humour has a vein of oddity, and the contrast between t
soft copiousness of the sentiment and the rigid lines of ling
ing Puritanism which it suffuses, is rarely met with in Englan
Perhaps there is less repose in the American style; there
certainly a curious unrestfulness in the effort, less common
English writers, to bend metaphors to unwonted uses. F
are these differences, with others I might mention — an
after all, they are slight — due to any cause connected w
politics? Are they not rather due to a mixed and curious
intertwined variety of other causes which have moulded t
American mind during the last two centuries? Americ
imagination has produced nothing more conspicuously origi
than the romances of Hawthorne. If any one says that he fi
something in them which he remembers in no previous E
lish writer, we know what is meant and probably agree. I
can it be said that there is anything distinctively Americ
in Hawthorne, that is to say, that his specific quality is o

kind which reappears in other American writers? Few will affirm this. The most peculiar, and therefore I suppose the most characteristically American school of thought, has been what used to be called the Concord or Transcendental school of fifty years ago; among the writings produced by which those of Emerson are best known in Europe. Were the authors of that school distinctively democratic either in the colour of their thought, or in its direction, or in the style which expresses it? And if so, can the same democratic tinge be discerned in the authors of to-day? I doubt it; but such matters do not admit of proof or disproof. One must leave them to the literary feeling of the reader.

A very distinguished American man of letters once said to me that he hated nothing so much as to hear people talk about American literature. He meant, I think, that those who did so were puzzling themselves unnecessarily to find something which belonged to a new country and a democratic country, and were forgetting or ignoring the natural relation of works of imagination and thought produced in America to books written by men of the same race in the Old World before and since 1776.

So far, then, as regards American literature generally, I do not believe that there is in it anything specifically democratic. For if we look at the various departments of speculative thought, such as metaphysics and theology, or at those which approach nearer to the exact sciences, such as economics and jurisprudence, shall we find that the character and substance of the doctrines propounded bear marked traces of a democratic influence. Why should we be surprised at this, seeing that the influence of a form of government is only one among many influences, even where a nation stands alone, and creates a literature distinctively local? But can books written in the United States be deemed to constitute a literature locally American in the same sense as the literatures of France and Germany, of Italy and Russia, belong to those countries? For the purposes of thought and art the United States is a part of England, and England is a part of America. Many English books are more widely read and strike deeper to the heart in America than in England. Some American books have a like fortune in England. Differences there are, but differences how

trivial compared with the resemblances in temper, in feelin in susceptibility to certain forms of moral and physical beaut in the general view of life and nature, in the disposition revere and be swayed by the same matchless models of th elder literature which both branches of the English race c equally claim. American literature does not to-day differ mo from English literature than the Scottish writers of eighty a hundred years ago — Burns, Scott, Adam Smith, Reid, Hum Robertson — differed from their English contemporaries. The was a fondness for abstractions and generalizations in t Scottish prose writers; there was in the Scottish poets a bloo and fragrance of mountain heather which gave to their wo a charm of freshness and singularity, like that which a fai touch of local accent gives to the tongue of an orator. B they were English as well as Scottish writers: they belong English literature and make part of its glory to the wo beyond. So Fenimore Cooper, Hawthorne, Emerson, Lon fellow, and those on whom their mantle has fallen, belong England as well as to America; and English writers, as th more and more realize the vastness of the American public th address, will more and more feel themselves to be American well as English, and will often find in America not only larger but a more responsive audience.

We have been here concerned not to discuss the merits a estimate the place of American thinkers and writers, but on to examine the relation in which they stand to their politi and social environment. That relation, however, sets bef us one more question. The English-speaking population the United States will soon be twice as large as that of United Kingdom. The white part of it is a more educa population, in which a greater number of persons come un the influence of books and might therefore be stirred up intellectual production. Why then does it not make m important contributions to the common literary wealth of race? Is there a want of creative power? and if so, to w is the want due?

This is a question frequently propounded. I propose to c sider it in the chapter which follows.

CHAPTER CXI

CREATIVE INTELLECTUAL POWER

THERE is a street in Florence on each side of which stand atues of the famous Florentines of the fourteenth and fifenth centuries, — Dante, Giotto, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Ghiberti, achiavelli, Michael Angelo, and others scarcely less illustris, all natives of the little city which in their days had never a pulation of more than seventy thousand souls.[1] No one can lk between these rows of world-famous figures, matched by other city of the modern world, without asking himself what use determined so much of the highest genius to this one ot; why in Italy herself populous Milan and Naples and enice have no such list to show; why the succession of greatss stopped with the beginning of the sixteenth century and s never been resumed? Questions substantially the same nstantly rise to the mind in reading the history of other untries. Why did England produce no first-rate poet in the o stirring centuries between Chaucer and Shakespeare, and ain in the century and a half between Milton's birth and ordsworth's? Why have epochs of comparative sterility more an once fallen upon Germany and France? and why has usic sometimes reached its highest pitch of excellence at oments when the other arts were languishing? Why does e sceptre of intellectual and artistic leadership pass now to e great nation, now to another, inconstant and unpredictable are the shifting winds?

These questions touch the deepest and most complex probns of history; and neither historian nor physiologist has t been able to throw any real light upon them. Even the mmonplace remark that times of effort and struggle tend to

[1] Petrarch saw the light in Arezzo, but his family was Florentine, and it was a mere accident that he was born away from his own city.

develop an unusually active intellectual movement, and th
with to awaken or nourish rare geniuses, is not altogether t
for some of the geniuses have arisen at moments when t
was no excitement to call them forth, and at other ti
seasons of storm and stress have raised up no one capabl
directing the efforts or interpreting the feelings of his gen
tion. One thing, however, is palpable: numbers have noth
to do with the matter. There is no average of a man of ge
to so many thousands or millions of persons. Out of the s
thousand of Florence there arise during two centuries n
men of undying fame than out of huge London during the
three centuries. Even the stock of solid second-class abi
does not necessarily increase with increasing numbers; w
as to those rare combinations of gifts which produce poetr
philosophy of the first order, they are revealed no more
quently in a great European nation now than they were
Semitic tribe or a tiny Greek city twenty-five or thirty
turies ago.

There is therefore no reason why the absence of brill
genius among the sixty-five millions in the United St
should excite any surprise; we might as well wonder
there is no Goethe, or Schiller or Kant or Hegel in the
many of to-day, so much more populous and better educ
than the Germany of their birth-time. It is not to be ma
reproach against America that men like Tennyson or Da
have not been born there. "The wind bloweth wher
listeth;" the rarest gifts appear no one can tell why or h
In broad France a century ago no man was found abl
spring upon the neck of the Revolution and turn it to his
Fate brought her favourite from a wild Italian island, that
but just passed under the yoke of the nation to which it
a master.

The question we have to ask as regards the United Stat
therefore not why it has given us few men of the highest
rarest distinction, but whether it has failed to produce its
share of talents of the second rank, that is, of men capab
taking a lead in all the great branches of literary or artist
scientific activity, men who instruct and delight their
generation, though possibly future generations may not
all of them in remembrance.

Have fewer men of this order adorned the roll of fame in the Jnited States, during the century of their independence, than n England, or France, or Germany during the same period? Obviously this is the fact as regards art in all its branches; nd also as regards physical and mathematical science. In terature the disparity is less evident, yet most candid Ameri- ans will agree with Englishmen that it is greater than those ho know the education and intelligence of the younger people ould have expected. I pass by oratory and statesmanship, ecause comparison is in these fields very difficult. The fact nerefore being admitted, we have to endeavour to account for it.

If the matter were one of numerical averages, it would be ertinent to remark that of the sixty-six millions of people in ne United States seven or eight millions are negroes, at pres- nt altogether below the stratum from which production can be xpected; that of the whites there may be two millions to hom English is a foreign language, and that several millions e recent immigrants from Europe. This diminishes the ontrast between numbers and intellectual results. But num- ers have so little to do with the question that the point scarcely eserves a passing reference.

Those who have discussed the conditions of intellectual pro- uctivity have often remarked that epochs of stir and excite- ent are favourable, because they stimulate men's minds, tting new ideas afloat, and awakening new ambitions. It is so true that vigorous unremitting labour is, speaking gener- ly, needed for the production of good work, and that one is erefore less entitled to expect it in an indolent time and from embers of the luxurious classes. But it is not less true, though ss frequently observed, that tranquillity and repose are neces- ry to men of the kind we are considering, and often helpful en to the highest geniuses, for the evolving of new thoughts d the creation of forms of finished and harmonious beauty. e who is to do such work must have time to meditate, and use, and meditate again. He must be able to set his crea- n aside, and return to it after days or weeks to look at it th fresh eyes. He must be neither distracted from his main rpose, nor hurried in effecting it. He must be able to con- ntrate the whole force of his reason or imagination on one ject, to abstract himself when needful from the flitting sights

and many-voiced clamour of the outer world. Juvenal sa
this long ago about the poet; it also applies, though possib
in a lower degree, both to the artist and to the serious thinke
or delicate workman, in any field of literature, to the met
physician, the theologian, the philosophic historian, the econ
mist, the philologist, even the novelist and the statesman.
have heard men who had gone from a quiet life into politi
complain that they found their thinking powers wither, a
that while they became far more expert in getting up subje
and speaking forcibly and plausibly, they found it harder a
harder to form sound general views and penetrate beneath t
superficialities of the newspaper and the platform. Interrupt
thought, trains of reflection or imaginative conceptions co
stantly broken by a variety of petty transient calls of busine
claims of society, matters passing in the world to note a
think of, not only tire the mind but destroy its chances
attaining just and deep views of life and nature, as a wi
ruffled pool ceases to reflect the rocks and woods around
Mohammed falling into trances on the mountain above Mec
Dante in the sylvan solitudes of Fonte Avellana, Cervan
and Bunyan in the enforced seclusion of a prison, Hegel
wrapt and lost in his speculations that, taking his manuscr
to the publisher in Jena on the day of the great battle, he w
surprised to see French soldiers in the streets; these are typ
of the men and conditions which give birth to thoughts th
occupy succeeding generations: and what is true of the
greatest men is perhaps even more true of men of the ne
rank. Doubtless many great works have been produced amo
inauspicious surroundings, and even under severe pressure
time; but it will, I think, be almost invariably found that t
producer had formed his ideas or conceived his creations
hours of comparative tranquillity, and had turned on them t
full stream of his powers to the exclusion of whatever cou
break or divert its force.

In Europe men call this a century of unrest. But t
United States is more unrestful than Europe, more unrest
than any country we know of has yet been. Nearly every c
is busy; those few who have not to earn their living and
not feel called to serve their countrymen, find themselves
of place, and have been wont either to make amusement i

business or to transfer themselves to the ease of France or Italy. The earning of one's living is not, indeed, incompatible with intellectually creative work, for many of those who have done such work best have done it in addition to their gainful occupation, or have earned their living by it. But in America it is unusually hard for any one to withdraw his mind from the endless variety of external impressions and interests which daily life presents, and which impinge upon the mind, I will not say to vex it, but to keep it constantly vibrating to their touch. Life is that of the squirrel in his revolving cage, never still even when it does not seem to change. It becomes every day more and more so in England, and English literature and art show increasing marks of haste. In the United States the ceaseless stir and movement, the constant presence of newspapers, the eagerness which looks through every pair of eyes, even that active intelligence and sense of public duty, strongest in the best minds, which make a citizen feel that he ought to know what is passing in the wider world as well as in his own, all these render life more exciting to the average man than it is in Europe, but chase away from it the opportunities for repose and meditation which art and philosophy need, as growing plants need the coolness and darkness of night no less than the blaze of day. The type of mind which American conditions have evolved is quick, vigorous, practical, versatile; but it is unfavourable to the natural germination and slow ripening of large and luminous ideas; it wants the patience that will spend weeks or months on bringing details to an exquisite perfection. And accordingly we see that the most rich and finished literary work America has given us has proceeded from the older regions of the country, where the pulsations of life are slower and steadier than in the West or in the great commercial cities. It was from New England that the best books of the last generation came; and that not solely because the English race was purest there, and education most generally diffused, for the New Englanders who have gone West, though they have carried with them their moral standard and their bright intelligence, seem either to have left behind their gift for literary creation, or to care to employ it only in teaching and in journalism.

It may be objected to this view that some of the great

literary ages, such as the Periclean age at Athens, the Medi
cean age at Florence, the age of Elizabeth in England, hav
been ages full of movement and excitement. But the unrest
fulness which prevails in America is altogether different fron
the large variety of life, the flow of stimulating ideas an
impressions which marked those ages. Life is not as interest
ing in America, except as regards commercial speculation, a
it is in Europe, because society and the environment of ma
are too uniform. It is hurried and bustling; it is filled wit
a multitude of duties and occupations and transient impres
sions. In the ages I have referred to, men had time enough fo
all there was to do, and the very scantiness of literature an
rarity of news made that which was read and received te
more powerfully upon the imagination.

Nor is it only the distractions of American life that clo
the wings of invention. The atmosphere is over full of a
that pertains to material progress. Americans themselves say
when excusing the comparative poverty of learning and science
that their chief occupation is at present the subjugation o
their continent, that it is an occupation large enough to deman
most of the energy and ambition of the nation, but that pre
ently, when this work is done, the same energy and ambitio
will win similar triumphs in the fields of abstract though
while the gifts which now make them the first nation in th
world for practical inventions, will then assure to them a lik
place in scientific discovery. There is evidently much trut
in this. The attractions of practical life are so great to me
conscious of their own vigour, the development of the We
and the vast operations of commerce and finance which have a
companied that development have absorbed so many strenuou
talents, that the supply of ability available not only for pu
science (apart from its applications) and for philosophical an
historical studies, but even for statesmanship, has been pr
portionately reduced. But, besides this withdrawal of an u
usually large part of the nation's force, the predominance
material and practical interests has turned men's thoughts an
conversation into a channel unfavourable to the growth of th
higher and more solid kinds of literature, perhaps still mo
unfavourable to art. Goethe said, "If a talent is to be speedi
and happily developed the chief point is that a great deal

intellect and sound culture should be current in a nation." There is certainly a great deal of intellect current in the United States. But it is chiefly directed to business, that is, to railways, to finance, to commerce, to inventions, to manufactures (as well as to practical professions like law), things which play a relatively larger part than in Europe, as subjects of universal attention and discussion. There is abundance of sound culture, but it is so scattered about in divers places and among small groups which seldom meet one another, that no large cultured society has arisen similar to that of European capitals or to that which her universities have created for Germany. In Boston thirty years ago a host could have brought together round his table nine men as interesting and cultivated as Paris or London would have furnished. But a similar party of eighteen could not have been collected, nor even the nine anywhere except in Boston. At present, culture is more diffused: there are many cities where men of high attainments and keen intellectual interests are found, and associate themselves in literary or scientific clubs. Societies for the study of particular authors are frequent among women. I remember to have been told of a Homer club and an Æschylus club, formed by the ladies of St. Louis, and of a Dante club in some Eastern city. Nevertheless a young talent gains less than it would gain in Europe from the surroundings into which it is born. The atmosphere is not charged with ideas as in Germany, nor with critical *finesse* as in France. Stimulative it is, but the stimulus drives eager youth away from the groves of the Muses into the struggling throng of the market-place.

It may be thought fanciful to add that in a new country one whole set of objects which appeal to the imagination, are absent, — no castles gray with age; no solemn cathedrals whose altering styles of architecture carry the mind up or down the long stream of history from the eleventh to the seventeenth century; few spots or edifices consecrated by memories of famous men or deeds, and among these none of remote date. There is certainly no want of interest in those few spots: the warmth with which Americans cherish them puts to shame the indifference of the English Parliament to the historic and prehistoric sites and buildings of Britain. But not one American youth in a thousand comes under the spell of any such

associations. In the city or State where he lives there is not
ing to call him away from the present. All he sees is nev
and has no glories to set before him save those of accumulate
wealth and industry skilfully applied to severely practical end

Some one may say that if (as was observed in last chapte
English and American literature are practically one, there
no need to explain the fact that one part of a race undivide
for literary purposes leaves the bulk of literary production
be done by the other part, seeing that it can enter freely in
the labours of the latter and reckon them its own. To argu
thus would be to push the doctrine of the unity of the tw
branches rather too far, for after all there is much in America
conditions and life which needs its special literary and artist
interpretations; and the question would still confront us, wh
the transatlantic branch, nowise inferior in mental force, co
tributes less than its share to the common stock. Still it
certainly true that the existence of a great body of producer
in England of literature, as in France of pictures, diminish
the need for production in America. Or to put the same thin
in another way, if the Americans did not read English the
would evidently feel called on to create more high literatu
for themselves. Many books which America might produ
are not produced because the men qualified to write them kno
that there are already English books on the same subject; an
the higher such men's standard is, the more apt are they
overrate the advantages which English authors enjoy as com
pared with themselves. Many feelings and ideas which no
find adequate expression through the English books whi
Americans read would then have to be expressed throug
American books, and their literature would be not only mo
individual, but more copious and energetic. If it lost
breadth, it would gain in freshness and independence. Amer
can authors conceive that even the non-recognition of inte
national copyright told for evil on their profession. Sin
the native writer was undersold by reprints of English a
French books, which, paying nothing to the European autho
could be published at the cost of the paper and printing onl
native authorship was discouraged, native talent diverted in
other fields, while at the same time the intellectual standa
of the public was lowered and its taste vulgarized. It mig

ave been thought that the profusion of cheap reprints would uicken thought and diffuse the higher kinds of knowledge nong the masses. But by far the largest part of these eprints, and the part most extensively read, were novels, and nong them many flimsy novels, which drove better books, ncluding some of the best American fiction, out of the market, nd tended to Europeanize the American mind in the worst ay. One may smile at the suggestion I have met with that ne allegiance of the working classes to their democratic insti-itions will be seduced by descriptions of English duchesses; et it is probably true — eminent observers assure one of it — nat the profusion of new frothy or highly spiced fiction offered fivepence or tenpence a volume did much to spoil the popular alate for the enjoyment of more wholesome and nutritious food. nd whatever injures the higher literature by diminishing the emand, may further injure it by creating an atmosphere un-vourable to the growth of pure and earnest native literary lent.

What then of the newspapers? The newspapers are too large subject for this chapter, and their influence as organs of inion has been already discussed. The vigour and brightness many among them are surprising. Nothing escapes them: erything is set in the sharpest, clearest light. Their want reticence and delicacy is regretfully admitted by all educated mericans — the editors, I think, included. The cause of this ficiency is probably to be found in the fact that, whereas the st European journals were written for the polite world of rge cities, American journals were, early in their career, if t at its very beginning, written for the bulk of the people, d published in communities still so small that everybody's ncerns were already pretty well known to everybody else. ney had attained no high level of literary excellence when me forty years ago an enterprising man of unrefined taste eated a new type of "live" newspaper, which made a rapid ccess by its smartness, copiousness, and variety, while dressing itself entirely to the multitude. Other papers were most forced to shape themselves on the same lines, because e class which desired something more choice was still rela-ely small; and now the journals of the chief cities have come such vast commercial concerns that they still think

first of the mass and are controlled by its tastes, which th have themselves done so much to create. There are cit where the more refined readers who dislike flippant pers alities are counted by tens of thousands, but in such cit competition is now too severe to hold out much prospect success to a paper which does not expect the support of hu dreds of thousands. It is not, however, with the æsthetic moral view of the newspaper that we are here concerned, with the effect on the national mind of the enormous ra which the reading of newspapers bears to all other reading ratio higher than even in France or England. A famous E lishman, himself a powerful and fertile thinker, contras the value of the history of Thucydides with that of a sin number of the *Times* newspaper, greatly to the advantage the latter. Others may conceive that a thoughtful study Thucydides, or, not to go beyond our own tongue, of Bac Milton, Locke, or Burke, perhaps even of Gibbon, Grote, Macaulay, will do more to give keenness to the eye a strength to the wings of the mind than a whole year's read of the best daily newspaper. It is not merely that the mat is of more permanent and intrinsic worth, nor that the man and style form the student's taste; it is not merely that in newspaper we are in contact with persons like ourselves, in other case with rare and splendid intellects. The whole a tude of the reader is different. His attention is loose, mind unbraced, so that he does not stop to scrutinize an ar ment, and forgets even valuable facts as quickly as he has lea them. If he read Burke as he reads the newspaper, Bu would do him little good. And therefore the habit of m produced by a diet largely composed of newspapers is adv to solid thinking and dulling to the sense of beauty. Scorc and stony is the soil which newspaper reading has prepare receive the seeds of genius.

Does the modern world really gain, so far as creative thou is concerned, by the profusion of cheap literature? It question one often asks in watching the passengers on American railway. A boy walks up and down the car seat ing newspapers and books in paper covers right and left a goes. The newspapers are glanced at, though probably n people have read several of the day's papers already.

oks are nearly all novels. They are not bad in tone, and metimes they give incidentally a superficial knowledge of ings outside the personal experience of the reader; while om their newspapers the passengers draw a stock of informa-on far beyond that of a European peasant, or even of an erage European artisan. Yet one feels that this constant ccession of transient ideas, none of them impressively though any of them startlingly stated, all of them flitting swiftly st the mental sight as the trees flit past the eyes when one oks out of the car window, is no more favourable to the velopment of serious intellectual interests and creative intel-ctual power than is the limited knowledge of the European tisan or peasant.

Most of the reasons I have hazarded to account for a phe-menon surprising to one who recognizes the quantity of tellect current in America, and the diffusion, far more neral than in any other country, of intellectual curiosity, e reasons valid in the Europe of to-day as compared with the rope of last century, and still more true of the modern orld as compared with the best periods of the ancient. inting is by no means pure gain to the creative faculties, natever it may be to the acquisitive; even as a great ancient inker seems to have thought that the invention of writing in gypt had weakened the reflective powers of man. The ques-on follows, Are these causes, supposing them to be true uses, likely to be more or less operative in the America of xt century than they now are? Will America become more nat Europe is now, or will she be even more American?

I have elsewhere thrown out some conjectures on this point. eantime it is pertinent to ask what are the most recent devel-ments of American thought and research, for this will help to see whether the tide of productive endeavour is rising or ling.

The abundant and excellent work done in fiction need be entioned only for the sake of calling attention to the interest has, over and above its artistic merit, as a record of the al manners and usages and types of character in various rts of the Union — types which are fast disappearing. The eoles of Louisiana, the negroes under slavery, with African es still surviving in their memories, the rough but kindly

backwoodsmen of Indiana forty years ago, the mountain f
of Tennessee, the humours of the Mississippi steamboat
the adventurous life of the Far West, are all known to Eur
through the tales of writers now living, as the Indians of nin
years ago became known through the romances of Fenim
Cooper. However, this is familiar ground to European read
so I pass to work of a less generally attractive order.

Thirty years ago the standard of classical scholarship
low, and even the school commentaries on classical authors
far short of those produced in Germany or England. N
adays both in classical and in Oriental philology admira
thorough and painstaking work is produced. I have he
high European authorities observe that there is an alm
excessive anxiety among American scholars to master all t
has been written, even by third-rate Germans, and that
desire they evince to overtake Germany in respect of knowle
betrays some among them into the German fault of neglect
merits of form and style. In the sciences of nature, especi
in those of observation, remarkable advances have been ma
Dr. Asa Gray, whom the eldest American university has la
lost, was one of the two or three greatest botanists of his
Much excellent work has been done in geology and palæ
tology, particularly in exploring the Rocky Mountain regi
Both for the excellence of their instruments and the accu
of their observations, the astronomers stand in the front ra
nor do they fall behind Europe in the theoretical part of
science. In some branches of physics and chemistry, suc
spectrum analysis, American investigators have won like fa
Competent authorities award the highest praise to their re
contributions to biology and to medical science. In econo
they seem to stand before either England or France, bot
regards the extent to which the subject is studied in unive
ties and as regards the number of eminent persons who
occupies. In jurisprudence and law, American text-books
quite as good as those produced in England;[1] and one aut
the late Mr. Justice Story, deserves, looking to the quan
as well as to the quality of his work, to be placed at the

[1] The number of legal journals and magazines in the United States is
much larger than in England, and the average of workmanship in them s
higher.

all who have handled these topics in the English tongue
ring the last seventy years. Political science has begun to be
died more energetically than in England, where, to be sure,
s scarcely studied at all; and every year sees treatises and
icles of permanent value added to the scanty modern litera-
e which our language possesses on this subject. Similarly
re is great activity in the field of both secular and ecclesi-
ical history, though as the work done has largely taken the
ection of inquiries into the early history of institutions,
l has altogether been more in the nature of research than of
atises attractive to the general public, its quantity and its
rits have not yet been duly appreciated even at home, much
s in Europe. Indeed, it is remarkable how far from showy
l sensational is the bulk of the work now done in America.
s mostly work of the German type, solid, careful, exact, and
en dry, not at all the sort of work which theorists about de-
cracy would have looked for, since it appeals rather to the
rned few than to the so-called general reader. One receives
impression that the class of intellectual workers, who until
ently wanted institutions in which the highest and fullest
ining could be had, have now become sensible that their
ntry, occupied in developing its resources and educating its
inary citizens, had fallen behind Europe in learning and
ence, and that they are therefore the more eager to accumu-
knowledge and spend their energy in minutely laborious
cial studies.[1]

may be reminded that neither in the departments above
ntioned, nor in statesmanship, can one point to many bril-
t personalities. The men whose names rise to the lips of
uropean are all advanced in life. Perhaps this is true
Europe also; perhaps the world has entered on an age of
diocrities. Some one lately said that there was now nobody
Paris, Berlin, or London under sixty years of age whom one
ld cross the street to look at. If this be so, it is not merely
use length of years has given better chances of winning
e, for nearly all the men now famous in Europe had won
e before they were forty. There have been periods in

[1] The extreme pains taken in America to provide every library with a
ified catalogue directing readers to the books on each subject, illustrates
endency.

history when striking figures were lacking, although g
events seemed to call for them. As regards America, if t
be few persons of exceptional gifts, it is significant that
number of those who are engaged in scientific work, whe
in the investigation of nature or in the moral, political,
historical sciences, is larger, relatively to the populatio
the country, than it was thirty years ago, the methods be
the work done more solid, the spirit more earnest and ea
Nothing more strikes a stranger who visits the Amer
universities than the ardour with which the younger ger
tion has thrown itself into study, even kinds of study w
will never win the applause of the multitude. There is r
zeal and heartiness among these men, more freshness of m
more love of learning for its own sake, more willingnes
forego the chances of fame and wealth for the sake of ad
to the stock of human knowledge, than is to be found to-da
Oxford or Cambridge, or in the universities of Scotland.
is reminded of the scholars of the Renaissance flinging th
selves into the study of rediscovered philology, or of the
man universities after the War of Liberation. And unde
impressions formed in mingling with such men, one learn
agree with the conviction of the Americans that for a na
so abounding in fervid force there is reserved a fruitful ca
in science and letters, no less than in whatever makes mat
prosperity.

CHAPTER CXII

THE RELATION OF THE UNITED STATES TO EUROPE

NE cannot discuss American literature and thought with-
asking, What is the intellectual relation of the United
es to Europe? Is it that of an equal member of the great
ublic of letters? Or is it that of a colony towards the
her country, or of a province towards a capital? Is it, to
instances from history, such a relation as was that of
ne to Greece in the second and first centuries before Christ?
f Northern and Western Europe to Italy in the fifteenth?
f Germany to France in the eighteenth? in all of which
s there was a measure of intellectual dependence on the
of a nation which felt itself in other respects as strong
r stronger than that whose models it followed, and from
se hearth it lighted its own flame.

o answer this question we must first answer another —
do the Americans themselves conceive their position
ards Europe? and this, again, suggests a third — What
the American people think of itself?

fty, or even forty years ago, the conceit of this people was
word. It was not only self-conscious but obtrusive and
essive. Every visitor satirized it, Dickens most keenly of
n forgiving whom the Americans gave the strongest proof
heir good nature. Doubtless all nations are either vain or
d, or both; and those not least who receive least recogni-
from their neighbours.[1] A nation could hardly stand
out this element to support its self-reliance; though when
ed to an extreme it may, as happens with the Turks, make
nal ruin the more irretrievable. But American conceit
been steadily declining as the country has grown older,
aware of its true strength, more respected by other coun-

[1] The Danes and Portuguese are examples.

tries.[1] There was less conceit after the Civil War than be
though the Civil War had revealed elements of greatness u
pected by foreigners; there is less now than there was a
close of the Civil War. An impartially rigorous censor
some other planet might say of the Americans that they
at this moment less priggishly supercilious than the Germ
less restlessly pretentious than the French, less pharisai
self-satisfied than the English. Among the upper or be
educated classes, glorification has died out, except of cours
Fourth of July and other public addresses, when the sc
of the national eagle must be heard. One sometimes fin
replaced by undue self-depreciation, with lamentations
the want of culture, the decline of faith, or the corruptio
politics. Among the masses it survives in an exultation
the size and material resources of the country, — the p
cally large is to them the sublime, — in an overestimat
men and events in American history; in a delight, stron
of course, among the recent immigrants, in the completene
social equality, and a corresponding contempt for the "
of Europe" who submit to be called "subjects" of their
ereign, in a belief in the superior purity of their domestic
and literature, and in the notion that they are the only pe
who enjoy true political liberty, liberty far fuller than
of England, far more orderly than that of France.[2] Ta
all classes together, they are now not more sensitive to e
nal opinion than the nations of Western Europe, and les

[1] Tocqueville complains that the Americans would not permit a stran
pass even the smallest unfavourable criticism on any of their institu
however warmly he might express his admiration of the rest.

[2] It must, however, be admitted that this whimsical idea is not confi
the masses. I find, for instance, in an address delivered by an eminen
to a distinguished literary fraternity in October, 1887, the following pa
"They (*i.e.* 'the immortal periods of the Declaration of Independence'
given political freedom to America and France, unity and nationality t
many and Italy, emancipated the Russian serf, relieved Prussia and Hu
from feudal tenures, *and will in time free Great Britain and Ireland al*

I have often asked Americans wherein they consider their freedom su
to that of the English, but have never found them able to indicate a
point in which the individual man is worse off in England as regards
his private civil rights, or his political rights, or his general liberty of
and thinking as he pleases. They generally turn the discussion to
equality, the existence of a monarchy and of hereditary titles, and so fo
matters which are of course quite different from freedom in its proper s

an the Russians, though they are still a trifle more apt to go rough Europe comparing what they find with what they left home. A foreign critic who tries to flout or scourge them longer disturbs their composure; his jeers are received h amusement or indifference. Their patriotism is in one pect stronger than that of Frenchmen or Englishmen, be- se it is less broken by class feeling, but it has ceased to be gressive.

Accordingly the attitude of thoughtful Americans to Europe no longer either the old open antagonism or the old latent f-distrust. It is that of a people which conceives itself to be ellectually the equal of any other people, but to have taken n itself for the time a special task which impedes it in the e of literary and artistic development. Its mission is to laim the waste lands of a continent, to furnish homes for reaming millions of strangers, to work out a system of monious and orderly democratic institutions. That it may il these tasks it has for the moment postponed certain other ks which it will in due time resume.[1] Meanwhile it may, hout loss of dignity or of faith in itself, use and enjoy the its of European intellect which it imports until it sees itself to rival them by native growths. If I may resort to a nely comparison, the Americans are like a man whose next- r neighbour is in the habit of giving musical parties in the mer evenings. When one of these parties comes off, he with his family in the balcony to enjoy the quartettes and s which float across to him through the open windows. He s no inferiority, knowing that when he pleases he can have formers equally good to delight his own friends, though for year he prefers to spend his surplus income in refurnish- his house or starting his son in business.

here is of course a difference in the view of the value of opean work as compared with their own, taken by the e educated and by the less educated classes. Of the latter e fail to appreciate the worth of culture and of science, for practical purposes, as compared with industrial suc- , though in this respect they are no more obtuse than the

[1] A Chicago man is reported to have expressed this belief with characteristic ness in the sentence "Chicago has had no time for culture yet, but when oes take hold she will make it hum."

bulk of Englishmen; and they accordingly underrate th obligations to Europe. Others, knowing that they ought admire works of imagination and research, but possessed more patriotism than discernment, cry up second or third r fiction, poetry, and theology because it is American, and to believe that their country gives to Europe as much she receives. Taste for literature is so much more diffu than taste in literature that a certain kind of fame is ea won. There are dozens of poets and scores of poetesses m admired in their own State, some even beyond its limits, w no merit but that of writing verse which can be scanned, will raise no blush on the most sensitive cheek. Criticism lenient, or rather it does not exist, for the few journals wh contain good reviews are little read except in four or Northern Atlantic States, and several inland cities. A rea active and searching criticism, which should appraise liter work on sound canons, not caring whether it has been p duced in America, or in Europe, by a man or by a woman the East or in the West, is one of the things most needed America. Among highly educated men this extravagant preciation of native industry produces a disgust express itself sometimes in sarcasm, sometimes in despondency. M deem their home-grown literature trivial, and occupy th selves with European books, watching the presses of Engla France, and Germany more carefully than almost any one c in England. Yet even these, I think, cherish silently faith that when the West has been settled and the railw built, and possibilities of sudden leaps to wealth diminish when culture has diffused itself among the classes whose e cation is now superficial, and their love of art extended it from furniture to pictures and statuary, American literat will in due course flower out with a brilliance of bloom an richness of fruit rivalling the Old World.

The United States are, therefore, if this account be corr in a relation to Europe for which no exact historical para can be found. They do not look up to her, nor seek to m themselves after her. They are too proud for a province, large for a colony. They certainly draw from Europe more thought than they send to her, while of art they h produced little and exported nothing; though what they

ow produce, improves in quality. Yet they cannot be said
be led or ruled by Europe, because they apply their own
andards and judgment to whatever they receive.

Their special relations to the leading European countries are
orth noting. In old colonial days England was everything.
he revolt of 1776 produced an estrangement which might
ave been healed after 1783, had England acted with more
urtesy and tact, but which was embittered by her scornful
titude. Wounds which were just beginning to scar over
ere reopened by the war of 1812; and the hostility continued
long as the generation lived whose manhood saw that war.
ocqueville, in 1833, says he can imagine no hatred more
enomous than that between the Americans and the English.
ne generation which remembered 1812 was disappearing
hen the sympathy of the English upper classes for the South-
n Confederacy in 1861–65 lit up the almost extinguished
mes. These have been quenched, so far as the native
mericans are concerned, by the settlement of the Alabama
aims, which impressed the United States not merely as a
ncession to themselves, but as an evidence of the magna-
mity of a proud country. There is still a certain amount of
valry with England, and a certain suspicion that the English
e trying to patronize even when the latter are innocent of
ch intentions. Now and then an Englishman who, feeling
nself practically at home, speaks with the same freedom as
would use there, finds himself misunderstood. But these
gering touches of jealousy are slight compared with the
owing sympathy felt for "the old country," as it is still
led. It is the only European country in which the Ameri-
n people can be said to feel any personal interest, or towards
alliance with which they are drawn by any sentiment.
r a time, however, the sense of gratitude to France for her
in the War of Independence was very strong. It brought
ench literature as well as some French usages into vogue,
l increased the political influence which France exercised
ring the earlier years of her own Revolution. Still that
uence did not go far beyond the sphere of politics: one
ls it but slightly in the literature of the half century from
30 to 1830.

During the reign of Louis Napoleon, wealthy Americans

resorted largely to Paris, and there, living often for years together in a congenial atmosphere of display and amusement, imbibed undemocratic tastes and ideas, which through them found their way back across the ocean, and coloured certain sections of American society, particularly in New York. Although there is still an American colony in Paris, Parisian influence seems no longer to cross the Atlantic. French books, novels excepted, and these in translations, are not largely read. French politics excite little interest: France is practically not a factor at all in the moral or intellectual life of the country. Over art, however, especially painting and decoration, she has still great power. Many American artists study in Paris, indeed all resort thither who do not go to Rome or Florence. French pictures enjoy such favour with American dealers and private buyers as to make the native artists complain, not without reason, that equally good home-made work receives no encouragement;[1] and house decoration, in which America seems to stand before England, particularly in the skilful use of wood, is much affected by French designs and methods.

The enormous German immigration of the last thirty years might have been expected to go far towards Germanizing the American mind, giving it a taste for metaphysics on the one hand, and for minutely patient research on the other. It does not seem to have had either the one result or the other, or indeed any result whatever in the field of thought. It has enormously stimulated the brewing industry: it has retarded the progress of Prohibitionism: it has introduced more out-door life than formerly existed: it has increased the taste for music, it has broken down the strictness of Sabbath observance, and has indeed in some cities produced what is commonly called "a Continental Sunday." But the vast majority of German immigrants have belonged to the humbler classes and were but faintly influenced by their own literature. There have been among them extremely few *savants*, or men likely

[1] There was, until 1894, a heavy customs duty on foreign works of art, but this does not greatly help the native artist, for the men who buy pictures do usually buy notwithstanding the duty, while it prevents the artist from furnishing himself with the works he needs to have around him for the purpose of his own training.

become *savants*, nor have these played any conspicuous part in he universities or in literature.[1]

Nevertheless the influence of Germany has been of late years owerfully stimulative upon the cultivated classes, for not only re German treatises largely read, but many of the most promsing graduates of the universities proceed to Germany for a ear or two to complete their studies, and there become imbued ith German ideas and methods. The English universities ave, by their omission to develop advanced instruction in pecial branches of knowledge, lost a golden opportunity of oming into relation with and influencing that academic youth f America in whose hands the future of American science and earning lies. This German strain in American work has, owever, not tended towards the propagation of metaphysical chools, metaphysics themselves being now on the ebb in Gerany. It appears in some departments of theology, and is lso visible in historical and philological studies, in economics, nd in the sciences of nature.

On the more popular kinds of literature, as well as upon anners, social usages, current sentiment generally, England nd her influences are of course nearer and more potent than hose of any other European country, seeing that English books o everywhere among all classes, and that they work upon hose who are substantially English already in their fundamenal ideas and habits. Americans of the cultivated order, and specially women, are more alive to the movements and changes n the lighter literature of England, and more curious about hose who figure in it, especially the rising poets and essayts, than equally cultivated English men and women. I have een repeatedly surprised to find books and men that had made o noise in London well known in the Atlantic States, and their erits canvassed with more zest and probably more acuteness han a London drawing-room would have shown. The verdicts f the best circles were not always the same as those of simir circles in England, but they were nowise biassed by national eling, and often seemed to proceed from a more delicate and mpathetic insight. I recollect, though I had better not men-

[1] Mr. A. D. White, in an interesting article on the influence of German ought in the United States, cites only Lieber and Mr. Carl Schurz. In blic life two or three Germans have attained high distinction.

tion, instances in which they welcomed English books which England had failed to appreciate, and refused to approve American books over which English reviewers had become ecstatic.

Passing English fashions in social customs and in such things as games sometimes spread to America. — possibly more often than similar American fashions do to England, — but sometimes encounter ridicule there. The Anglomaniac is a familiar object of good-humoured satire. As for those large movements of opinion or taste or practical philanthropy in which a parallelism or correspondence between the two countries may often be discerned, this correspondence is more frequently due to the simultaneous action of the same causes than to any direct influence of the older country. In theology, for instance, the same relaxation of the rigid tests of orthodoxy has been making way in the churches of both nations. In the Protestant Episcopal church there has been a similar, though far less pronounced, tendency to the development of an ornate ritual. The movement for dealing with city pauperism by voluntary organizations began later than the Charity Organization societies of England, but would probably have begun without their example. The University Extension movement, and the establishment of "university settlements" in the poorer parts of great cities are further instances. The semi-socialistic tendency which I have referred to as now noticeable among the younger clergy and the younger teachers in some of the universities, although similar to that which may be discerned in England, does not seem traceable to direct English influences. So too the rapidly growing taste for beauty in house decoration and in street architecture is a birth of the time rather than of Old World teaching, although it owes something to Mr. Ruskin's books, which have been more widely read in America than in England.

In political matters the intellectual sympathy of the two countries is of course less close than in the matters just described, because the difference between institutions and conditions involves a diversity in the problems which call for

[1] America has produced of late years at least one really distinguished architect now unhappily lost to her: and the art seems to be making rapid progress. European artists and critics who saw the buildings erected for the Chicago Exhibition of 1893 were greatly impressed by the inventiveness and taste that displayed: nor can a traveller fail to be struck by the beauty and variety of design shown by the villas which surround the richer cities.

practical solution. Political changes in England affect American opinion less than such changes in France affect English opinion, although the Americans know more and care more and judge more soundly about English affairs than the French do about English or the English about French. The cessation of bitterness between Great Britain and the Irish would make a difference in American politics, but no political event in England less serious than, let us say, the establishment of a powerful Socialist party, would sensibly tell on American opinion, just as no event happening beyond the Atlantic, except the rise and fall of the Southern Confederacy, has influenced the course of English political thought. However, the wise men of the West watch English experiments for light and guidance in their own troubles. A distinguished American who came four or five years ago to London to study English politics, told me that he did so in the hope of finding conservative institutions and forces from which lessons serviceable to the United States might be learned. After a fortnight, however, he concluded that England was in a state of suppressed revolution, and departed sorrowful.

On a review of the whole matter it will appear that although as respects most kinds of intellectual work America is rather in the position of the consumer, Europe, and especially England, in that of the producer, although America is more influenced by English and German books and by French art than these countries are influenced by her, still she does not look for initiative to them, or hold herself in any way their disciple. She is in many points independent; and in all fully persuaded of her independence.

Will she then in time develop a new literature, bearing the stamp of her own mint? She calls herself a new country: will she give the world a new philosophy, new views of religion, a new type of life in which plain living and high thinking may be more happily blended than we now see them in the Old World, a life in which the franker recognition of equality will give a freshness to ideas and to manners a charm of simplicity which the aristocratic societies of Europe have failed to attain?

As regards manners and life, she has already approached nearer this happy combination than any society of the Old World. As regards ideas, I have found among the most

cultivated Americans a certain cosmopolitanism of view, a
detachment from national or local prejudice, superior to that
the same classes in France, England, or Germany. In the ide
themselves there is little one can call novel or distinctive
American, though there is a kind of thoroughness in embra
ing or working out certain political and social conceptio
which is less common in England. As regards literatu
nothing at present indicates the emergence of a new typ
The influence of the great nations on one another grows alwa
closer, and makes new national types less likely to appe
Science, which has no nationality, exerts a growing sway ov
men's minds, and exerts it contemporaneously and similarly
all civilized countries. For the purposes of thought, at lea
if not of literary expression, the world draws closer togeth
and becomes more of a homogeneous community.

A visitor doubts whether the United States are, so far
the things of the mind are concerned, "a new country." T
people have the hopefulness of youth. But their institutio
are old, though many have been remodelled or new face
their religion is old; their views of morality and conduct a
old; their sentiments in matters of art and taste have n
greatly diverged from those of the parent stock. Is the me
fact that they inhabit new territories, and that the conditio
of life there have trained to higher efficiency certain gifts, a
have left others in comparative quiescence, is this fact su
cient so to transform the national spirit as to make the p
ducts of their creative power essentially diverse from those
the same race abiding in its ancient seats? A transplant
tree may bear fruit of a slightly different flavour, but the ap
remains an apple and the pear a pear.

However, it is still too early in the growth of the Unit
States to form conclusions on these high matters, almost t
soon to speculate regarding them. There are causes at wo
which may in time produce a new type of intellectual life; b
whether or not this come to pass, it can hardly be doubted th
when the American people give themselves some repose fr
their present labours, when they occupy themselves less w
doing and more with being, there will arise among them a lite
ture and a science, possibly also an art, which will tell up
Europe with a new force. It will have behind it the moment
of hundreds of millions of men.

CHAPTER CXIII

THE ABSENCE OF A CAPITAL

The United States are the only great country in the world hich has no capital. Germany and Italy were long without ne, because the existence of the mediæval Empire prevented ie growth in either country of a national monarchy. But the onderfully reconstructive age we live in has now supplied the ant; and although Rome and Berlin still fall short of being their respective states what Paris and London are to France id England, what Vienna and Pesth are to the Dual Monchy, they bid fair to attain a similar rank[1] in their respective ations. By a Capital I mean a city which is not only the at of political government, but is also by the size, wealth, id character of its population the head and centre of the untry, a leading seat of commerce and industry, a reservoir financial resources, the favoured residence of the great and werful, the spot in which the chiefs of the learned professons are to be found, where the most potent and widely read urnals are published, whither men of literary and scientific pacity are drawn. The heaping together in such a place of ese various elements of power, the conjunction of the forces rank, wealth, knowledge, intellect, naturally makes such a y a sort of foundry in which opinion is melted and cast, here it receives that definite shape in which it can be easily d swiftly propagated and diffused through the whole country,

[1] Athens, Lisbon, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Brussels, are equally good instances among the smaller countries. In Switzerland, Bern has not reached same position, because Switzerland is a federation, and, so to speak, an ificial country made by history. Zurich, Lausanne, and Geneva are intelctually quite as influential. So Holland retains traces of her federal condin in the relatively less important position of Amsterdam. Madrid being a dern city placed in a country less perfectly consolidated than most of the er states of Europe, is less of a capital to Spain than Lisbon is to Portugal Paris to France.

deriving not only an authority from the position of those w form it but a momentum from the weight of numbers in t community whence it comes. The opinion of such a ci becomes powerful politically because it is that of the perso who live at headquarters, who hold the strings of governme in their hands, who either themselves rule the state or a in close contact with those who do. It is true that under representative government power rests with those whom t people have sent up from all parts of the country. Still the members of the legislature reside in the capital, and cann but feel the steady pressure of its prevailing sentiment whi touches them socially at every point. It sometimes happe that the populace of the capital, by their power of overawi the rulers or perhaps effecting a revolution, are able to tu the fortunes of the state. But even where no such peril is be apprehended, any nation with the kind of a capital I s describing, acquires the habit of looking to it for light a leading, and is apt to yield to it an initiative in politi movements.

In the field of art and literature the influence of a gr capital is no less marked. It gathers to a centre the creati power of the country, and subjects it to the criticism of t best instructed and most polished society. The consta action and reaction upon one another of groups of capa men in an atmosphere at once stimulative to invention a corrective of extravagance may give birth to works wh isolated genius could hardly have produced. Goethe ma this observation as regards Paris, contrasting the centrali society of France with the dispersion of the elements of c ture over the wide area of his own Germany.

"Now conceive a city like Paris, where the highest talents of a gr kingdom are all assembled in a single spot, and by daily intercou strife, and emulation, mutually instruct and advance each other; wh the best works, both of nature and art, from all kingdoms of the ea are open to daily inspection, — conceive this metropolis of the worl say, where every walk across a bridge or across a square recalls so mighty past, and where some historical event is connected with ev corner of a street. In addition to all this, conceive not the Paris o dull spiritless time, but the Paris of the nineteenth century, in wh during three generations, such men as Molière, Voltaire, Diderot, and like, have kept up such a current of intellect as cannot be found twic

single spot on the whole world, and you will comprehend that a man of ent like Ampère, who has grown up amid such abundance, can easily something in his four-and-twentieth year."[1]

The same idea of the power which a highly polished and renuously active society has to educe and develop brilliant fts underlies the memorable description which Pericles gives Athens.[2] And the influence of such a society may be con-mplated with the greater satisfaction because it does not cessarily impoverish the rest of a country. The centraliza-on of intellectual life may tend to diminish the chances of riability, and establish too uniform a type; but it probably ves a higher efficiency to the men of capacity whom it draws to its own orbit than they could have attained in the isola-on of their natal spot.

In the case both of politics and of literature, the existence a capital tends to strengthen the influence of what is called ciety, that is to say, of the men of wealth and leisure who ve time to think of other matters than the needs of daily e, and whose company and approval are apt to be sought by e men of talent. Thus where the rich and great are gath-ed in one spot to which the nation looks, they effect more in e way of guiding its political thought and training its liter-y taste than is possible where they are dispersed over the ce of a large country. In both points, therefore, it will evi-ntly make a difference to a democratic country whether it s a capital, and what degree of deference that capital ceives. Paris is the extreme case of a city which has been erything to the national literature and art, and has sought be everything in national politics also. London, since the cline of Dublin and of Edinburgh, has stood without a itish rival in the domain of art and letters, and although e can hardly say that a literary society exists in London, st of the people who employ themselves in writing books l nearly all those who paint pictures live in or near it. er politics London has less authority than Paris has exerted France, doubtless because parts of the north and west of itain are more highly vitalized than the provinces of France, ile the English city is almost too populous to have a com-n feeling. Its very hugeness makes it amorphous.

[1] *Conversations with Eckermann.* [2] Thucyd. II. 37–41

What are the cities of the United States which can cla to approach nearest to the sort of capital we have been c sidering? Not Washington, though it is the meeting-place Congress and the seat of Federal administration. It ha relatively small population (in 1890, 230,392, of whom o third were negroes). Society consists of congressmen (about half the year), officials, diplomatists, and some rich a leisured people who come to spend the winter. The leaders finance, industry, commerce, and the professions are abse there are few men of letters, no artists, hardly any jour ists. What is called the fashionable society of Washingt which, being small, polished, and composed of people v constantly meet one another, is agreeable, and not the agreeable because it has a peculiar flavour, is so far from as ing to political authority as to deem it "bad form" to t politics.[1] Its political society on the other hand is so larg composed of officials, "professionals," and office-seekers, to produce an atmosphere unlike that of the nation at la and dangerous to those statesmen who breathe it too l without interruption.

Not New York, though it is now by far the most popul city. It is the centre of commerce, the sovereign of finar But it has no special political influence or power beyond tha casting a large vote, which is an important factor in deter ing the thirty-six presidential votes of the State. Busines its main occupation: the representatives of literature are f the journals, although certainly among the ablest and m widely read in the country, are, after all, New York journ and not, like those of Paris, London, or even Berlin, fessedly written for the whole nation. Next comes Phila phia, once the first city of the Union, but now standing be New York in all the points just mentioned, with even claim to be deemed a centre of art or opinion. Boston was a time the chosen home of letters and culture, and still conta in proportion to her population, a larger number of men women capable of making or judging good work than any o

[1] Washington being situated in the Federal District of Columbia is part of any State, and therefore enjoys no share in the Federal governm its inhabitants can vote neither for a member of Congress nor for pres tial electors; and the city is ruled, greatly to its advantage, by a Fe Commission. It is indeed the only well governed large city in the count

y. But she can no longer be said to lead abstract thought; ıch less current opinion. Chicago combines a vast popula- n, now second to that of New York only, with a central sition: she is in some respects more of a typical American y than any of the others I have named. But Chicago, so as political initiative goes, has no more weight than what e number of her voters represents, and does not yet count in or literature. Nor can one say that any of these cities is on e way to gain a more commanding position. New York will bably retain her pre-eminence in population and commercial ısequence, but she does not rise proportionately in culture, ile the centre of political gravity, shifting ever more and re to the West, will doubtless finally fix itself in the Missis- pi valley.[1]

t deserves to be remarked that what is true of the whole ıntry is also true of the great sections of the country. Of cities I have named, none, except possibly Boston and San ıncisco, can be said to be even a local capital, either for rposes of political opinion or of intellectual movement and dency. Boston retains her position as the literary centre New England: San Francisco has by her size a preponder- ıg influence on the Pacific coast. But no other great city egarded by the inhabitants of her own and the adjoining tes as their natural head, to which they look for political dance, or from which they expect any intellectual stimu- ce. Even New Orleans, though by far the largest place in South, is in no sense the metropolis of the South; and s little more for the South than set a conspicuous example municipal misgovernment to the surrounding common- lths. Though no Paris, no Berlin, stands above them, se great American cities are not more important in the ntry, or even in their own sections of the country, than ons and Bordeaux are in France, Hamburg and Cologne in rmany. Even as between municipal communities, even in

[1] A leading New York paper says (March, 1888), "In no capital that we v of does the cause of religion and morality derive so little support against ry from intellectual interest or activity of any description. This interest ts place here, but it leads a sickly existence as yet under the shadow of t wealth which cares not for it." This remark applies with equal force hicago and San Francisco, probably less to Baltimore, and still less to Bos- and some of the smaller cities.

the sphere of thought and literary effort, equality and l independence have in America their perfect work.

The geographical as well as political causes that have duced this equality are obvious enough, and only one n special mention. The seat of Federal government was in fixed at a place which was not even a village, but a piec swampy woodland,[1] not merely for the sake of preventing national legislature from being threatened by the mob of a g city, but because the jealousies of the States made it neces to place the legislature in a spot exempt from all State influ or jurisdiction. So too in each State the seat of governme rarely to be found in the largest city. Albany, not New Y is the capital of New York State; Springfield, not Chic of Illinois; Sacramento, not San Francisco, of Califor Harrisburg, not Philadelphia, of Pennsylvania. This seem have been so ordered not from fear of the turbulence of a population, but partly to secure a central spot, partly from jealousy which the rural districts and smaller cities fe the place which casts the heaviest vote, and may seek to the State resources for its own benefit.

It is a natural result of the phenomena described tha the United States public opinion crystallizes both less rap and in less sharp and well-defined forms than happens in t European countries which are led by the capital. The perature of the fluid in which opinion takes shape (if I venture to pursue the metaphor), is not so high all ov large country as in the society of a city, where the minds make opinion are in daily contact, and the process by w opinion is made is therefore slower, giving a somewhat amorphous product. I do not mean that a European ca generates opinion of one type only; but that each doct each programme, each type of views, whether politica

[1] Congress, however, did not remove from Philadelphia to the banks Potomac until 1800. Thomas Moore's lines on Washington as he saw it deserve to be quoted: —

> "An embryo capital where Fancy sees
> Squares in morasses, obelisks in trees;
> Where second-sighted seers the plain adorn
> With fanes unbuilt and heroes yet unborn,
> Though nought but woods and Jefferson they see,
> Where streets should run, and sages ought to be."

nomic or religious, is likely to assume in a capital its rpest and most pronounced form, that form being taken up propagated from the capital through the country. And is one reason why Americans were the first to adopt the tem of Conventions, mass meetings of persons belonging to articular party or advocating a particular cause, gathered n every corner of the country to exchange their ideas and berate on their common policy.

t may be thought that in this respect the United States er from the absence of a centre of light and heat. Admit- that there is some loss, there are also some conspicuous as. It is a gain that the multitude of no one city should ble to overawe the executive and the legislature, perhaps n to change the form of government, as Paris has so often e in France. It is a gain, for a democratic country, that feeling of what is called Society — that is to say, of those toil not, neither do they spin, who are satisfied with the ld, and are apt to regard it as a place for enjoyment — uld not become too marked and palpable in its influence on members of the legislature and the administration, that it uld rather be diffused over the nation and act insensibly n other classes through the ordinary relations of private than take visible shape as the voice of a number of lthy families gathered in one spot, whose luxury may ren- them the objects of envy, and the target for invective. although types of political view may form themselves swiftly, though doctrines may be less systematic, pro- mes less fully reasoned out than when the brisk intelli- e of groups gathered in a capital labours to produce them, may, when they do finally emerge from the mind of the le people, have a breadth and solidity proportioned to the ness of their growth, and be more truly representative of he classes, interests, and tendencies that exist within the on.

ow far the loss exceeds the gain as respects the specu- e and artistic sides of intellectual effort, it is too soon to rmine, for American cities are all the creatures of the last years. That which Goethe admired in Paris is evidently ssible to the dispersed geniuses of America. On the other , that indraught of talent from the provinces to Paris

which many thoughtful Frenchmen deplore, and which become more unfortunate since Paris has grown to be centre of amusement for the dissipated classes of Europe an experience which no other country need wish to unde Germany has not begun to produce more work or better w since she has given herself a capital; indeed, he who lo back over her annals since the middle of last century think that so far as scholarship, metaphysics, and poss even poetry are concerned, she gained from that very wan centralization which Goethe regretted. Great critics rea so vividly the defects of the system they see around th that they sometimes underrate the merits that go with th defects. It may be that in the next age American cities profit by their local independence to develop varieties gre than they now exhibit, and will evolve diverse types of li ary and artistic production. Europe will watch with curio the progress of an experiment which it is now too late for of her great countries to try.

CHAPTER CXIV

AMERICAN ORATORY

Oratory is an accomplishment in which Europeans believe
at Americans excel; and that this is the opinion of the Ameri-
ns themselves, although they are too modest to express it,
y be gathered from the surprise they betray when they find
Englishman fluent before an audience. Fifty years ago
y had the advantage (if it is an advantage) of much more
ctice than any European nation; but now, with democracy
umphant in England and France, the proportion of speeches
l speaking to population is probably much the same in all
ee countries. Some observations on a form of effort which
absorbed a good deal of the talent of the nation, seem
perly to belong to an account of its intellectual life.

Oratorical excellence may be said to consist in the combina-
n of five aptitudes —

nvention, that is to say, the power of finding good ideas and
weaving effective arguments.

kill and taste in the choice of appropriate words.

Readiness in producing appropriate ideas and words at short
notice.

Quickness in catching the temper and tendencies of the par-
ticular audience addressed.

Veight, animation, and grace in delivery.

uch excellence as the Americans possess, such superiority
hey may claim over Englishmen, consists rather in the
e latter of these than in the two former.

he substance of their speeches is not better than one finds
her countries, because substance depends on the intellectual
urces of the speaker and on the capacity of the audience
appreciating worthy matter. Neither is the literary form
er, that is to say, the ideas are not clothed in any choicer
uage. But there is more fluency, more readiness, more

self-possession. Being usually nimbler in mind than Englishman, and feeling less embarrassed on his legs, American is apt to see his point more clearly and to get at by a more direct path. He is less frequently confused a clumsy, less prosy also, because his sympathy with the au ence tells him when they begin to tire, and makes him sensi of the necessity of catching and holding their attention. I not deny that American speakers sometimes weary the listen but when they do so it is rather because the notions are co monplace and the arguments unsound than because, as mig happen in England, ideas of some value are tediously a pointlessly put. It is true that with the progress of der cracy, and the growing volume of speeches made, the level average public speaking has in Britain risen within the l twenty or thirty years, while the number of great orators h declined till now scarce any are left. Still, if one is to comp the two countries, the English race seems to have in Amer acquired a keener sensitiveness of sympathy. That habit deference to others, and that desire to be in accord with sentiments of others, which equality and democratic institutio foster, make the American feel himself more completely o of the audience and a partaker of its sentiments than an av age English speaker does. This may have the consequence the audience be ignorant or prejudiced, of dragging him do to its level. But it makes him more effective. Needless add that humour, which is a commoner gift in America th elsewhere, often redeems an otherwise uninteresting addre and is the best means of keeping speaker and audience in tou with one another.

A deliberate and even slow delivery is the rule in Americ public speaking, as it is in private conversation. This has advantage of making a story or a jest tell with more effe There is also, I think, less stiffness and hesitation amo American than among English speakers, greater skill in m aging the voice, because more practice in open-air meetin greater clearness of enunciation. But as regards grace, eit in action or in manner, the Teutonic race shows no m capacity on the other side of the Atlantic than it has genera done in England for rivalling the orators of Italy, Spain, France.

The commonest American defect is a turgid and inflated
le. The rhetoric is Rhodian rather than Attic, overloaded
h tropes and figures, apt to aim at concealing poverty or
eness in thought by exaggeration of statement, by a profu-
n of ornament, by appeals to sentiments too lofty for the
ject or the occasion. The florid diction of the debating club
he solemn pomp of the funeral oration is frequently invoked
en nothing but clearness of exposition or cogency of argu-
nt is needed. These faults have probably sprung from the
ctice of stump oratory, in which the temptation to rouse a
ltitude by declamation is specially strong. A man straining
voice in the open air is apt to strain his phrases also, and
mand attention by vehemence. They have been increased
the custom of having orations delivered on certain anniver-
es, and especially on the Fourth of July, for on these great
asions the speaker feels bound to talk "his very tallest."
blic taste, which was high in the days after the Revolution,
en it was formed and controlled by a small number of edu-
ed men, began to degenerate in the first half of this century.
pite the influence of several orators of the first rank, inces-
t stump speaking and the inordinate vanity of the average
ience brought a florid or inflated style into fashion, which
ame an easy mark for European satire. Of late years a
ction for the better seems to have set in. There are still
se who imitate Macaulay or Webster without the richness
he one or the stately strength of the other. The news-
ers, in acknowledging that a lecturer is fluent or lucid, still
plain if he is not also "eloquent." Commemorative ad-
sses, which are far more abundant than in Europe, usually
by over-finish of composition. But on the whole there has
n an improvement in the taste of listeners and in the style
peeches. Such improvement would be more rapid were it
for the enormous number of speeches by people who have
ly nothing to say, as well as by able men on occasions when
e is nothing to be said which has not been said hundreds
imes before. This is, of course, almost equally true of
land, and indeed of all popularly governed countries. Those
disparage popular government may fairly count profusion
peech as one of the drawbacks to democracy, and a draw-
which shows no signs of disappearing.

As respects the different kinds of oratory, that of the pu seems to show an average slightly higher than in Engl The visitor naturally hears the best preachers, for these ar course drawn to the cities, but whether he takes cities or r districts he forms the impression that mere dulness and c monplace are less common than in Great Britain, though h excellence may be equally rare. Even when the discours read, it is read in a less mechanical way, and there is altoge more sense of the worth of vivacity and variety. The ave length of sermons is a mean between the twenty minutes o Anglican minister and the fifty minutes of Scotland. The m ner is slightly less conventional, because the American cle man is less apt than his European brother to feel himse member of a distinct caste.

Forensic oratory seems to stand neither higher nor lo than it does in England, whose bar is not at this mon adorned by any speakers whom men go to hear simply for sake of their eloquence, as men flocked to listen to Erskin Brougham or Follett. In America, as in England, there many powerful advocates, but no consummate artist. Whe this is due to the failure of nature to produce persons speci gifted, or to the absence of trials whose issues and circ stances are calculated to rouse forensic ability to excepti efforts, or to a change in public taste, and a disposition to fer the practical to the showy, is a question which is o asked in England, and no easier to answer in America.

Congress, for reasons explained in the chapter treating o is a less favourable theatre for oratory than the great repre tative assemblies of Europe. The House of Representat has at no period of its history shone with lights of eloque though a few of Clay's great speeches were delivered i There is some good short brisk debating in Committee of Whole, but the set speeches are mostly pompous and he The Senate long maintained a higher level, partly from smaller size of its chamber, partly from its greater lei partly from the superior ability of its members. Webs and Calhoun's greatest efforts were made on its floor, and duced an enormous effect on the nation. At present, how the "full-dress debates" in the Senate want life, the long speeches being fired off rather with a view to their circula

the country than to any immediate effect on the as-
ibly. But the ordinary discussions of bills, or questions
policy, reveal plenty of practical speaking power. If there
little passion and no brilliancy, there is strong common-
se put in a plain and telling form.

Of the forty-seven State and Territorial legislatures not much
d be said. In them, as in the House of Representatives,
bulk of the work is done in committees, and the oppor-
ities for displays of eloquence are limited, which it is well
uld be the case. They are good enough schools to form a
ctical business speaker, and they do form many such. But
characteristic merits and defects of transatlantic oratory
more fully displayed on the stump and in those national
State nominating conventions whereof I have already
ken. So far as the handling great assemblies is an art
inable by a man who does not possess the highest gifts of
ught and imagination, it has been brought to perfection by
heroes of these mass meetings. They have learned how
deck out commonplaces with the gaudier flowers of elo-
nce; how to appeal to the dominant sentiment of the mo-
nt: above all, how to make a strong and flexible voice the
ns of rousing enthusiasm. They scathe the opposite party
vigorous invective; they interweave stories and jokes with
r declamatory passages so as to keep the audience con-
ntly amused. They deliver contemptible clap-trap with an
of hearty conviction. The party men who listen, because
re are few present at a mass meeting, and still fewer at a
vention, except members of the party which has convoked
gathering, are better pleased with themselves than ever,
go away roused to effort in the party cause. But there
been little argument all through, little attempt to get hold
he reason and judgment of the people. Stimulation, and
instruction or conviction, is the aim which the stump orator
before himself; and the consequence is that an election
paign is less educationally valuable than one conducted in
land, though by men less practised and skilful in speaking,
lly proves to English electors. It is worth remarking that
custom which in England requires a representative to de-
r at least once a year an address to his constituents, setting
h his view of the political situation and explaining his own

speeches and votes during the preceding session, does not se to be general in the United States. In fact the people of Northern States receive less political instruction by the liv voice than do those of England. When an instructive addr has to be given, it takes the form of a lecture, and is usu delivered by some well-known public man, who receives a for it.

There are three kinds of speech which, though they exis most European countries, have been so much more fully de oped beyond the Atlantic as to deserve some notice.

The first of these is the Oration of the Occasion. When anniversary comes round — and celebrations of an annivers are very common in America — or when a sort of festiva held in honour of some public event, such for instance as unveiling of a statue, or the erection of a monument o battlefield, or the opening of a city hall or State capitol the driving the last spike of a great railroad, a large par the programme is devoted to speaking. The chief speech entrusted to one eminent person, who is called the Orato the Day, and from whom is expected a long and highly finis harangue, the length and finish of which are wearisome t critical outsider, though the people of the locality are flatte Sometimes these speeches contain good matter — I could n tion instances where they have embodied personal recollecti of a distinguished man in whose honour the celebration being held — but the sort of artificial elevation at which speaker usually feels bound to maintain himself is apt to m him pompous and affected.

Although public dinners are less frequent than in Engla speeches of a complimentary and purely "epideictic" na of the English public banquet type are very common. Th is scarcely an occasion in life which brings forty or fifty pe together on which a prominent citizen or a stranger f Europe is not called upon "to offer a few remarks." No ject is prescribed for him: often no toast has to be propo or responded to:[1] he is simply put on his legs to talk u anything in heaven or earth which may rise to his mind.

[1] Of course there are often toasts given at public dinners; but they see be fewer in number than in England, and more varied, more judici adapted to the special occasion.

uropean who is at first embarrassed by this unchartered free-
om, presently discovers its advantages, for it enables him so
construct his speech as to lead up to whatever joke, or
oint, or complimentary observations he has ready at hand.
here is also more opening for variety than the conventional
niformity of an English toast-list permits.

The third form of discourse specially characteristic of the
nited States is the Lecture. It is less frequent and less
shionable now than forty years ago, partly from the rise of
onthly magazines full of excellent matter, partly because other
nds of evening entertainment have become more accessible to
ople outside the great cities. With the decline of Puritan
ntiment the theatre is now more popular than it then was.
ut the Lecture is still far more frequent and more valuable
a means of interesting people in literary, scientific, and
litical questions than anywhere in Europe, except possibly
Edinburgh. And the art of lecturing has been developed
a corresponding measure. A discourse of this kind, what-
er the merits of its substance, is usually well arranged, well
mposed to meet the taste of the audience, and above all, well
livered. Eminent Englishmen who go to lecture in America
e frequently criticised as ignorant of what may be called the
chnical part of their business. They may know a great deal,
is said, but they do not know how much the audience knows,
d assume a lower level of intelligence and knowledge than
ists, with the result of displeasing the latter. They are
notonous in manner, and unskilled in elocution. The Euro-
an lecturer, on the other hand, confesses himself annoyed
t only by the irreverent comments of the press but by the
parent coldness of the audience, which, though it will
plaud heartily at the end if well satisfied, refuses him the
ning encouragement of cheers, even when he invites them
pausing to drink a glass of water.

This grave reserve in American listeners surprises Euro-
ans,[1] especially those who have observed the excitability
own on presidential campaigns. It seems to arise from the

[1] A story is told of Edmund Kean acting before an audience in New Eng-
d which he found so chilling that at last he refused to come on for the next
e unless some applause were given, observing that such a house was enough
xtinguish Etna.

practical turn of their minds as well as from their intelligen
In an election campaign it is necessary and expedient to gi
vent to one's feelings; in listening to a lecture it is not. O
comes to be instructed or entertained, and comes with a criti
habit formed by hearing many lectures as well as reading ma
books. Something may also be due to the large proporti
of women in an American audience at lectures or other n
political occasions.

A stranger is, on the whole, inclined to think that the ki
of oratory in which the Americans show to most advantage
neither the political kind, abundant as it is, nor the commen
rative oration, assiduously as it is cultivated, but what may
called the lighter ornamental style, such as the after-dinn
speech. The fondness of the people for anecdotes, and th
skill in telling them, the general diffusion of humour, t
readiness in catching the spirit of an occasion, all contribu
to make their efforts in this direction more easy and hap
than those of the English, while furnishing less temptati
for the characteristic fault of a straining after effect. I ha
already observed that they shine in stump speaking, prope
so called — that is, in speaking which rouses an audience b
ought not to be reported. The reasons why their more seri
platform and parliamentary oratory remains somewhat infer
to that of Europe are, over and above the absence of mom
tous issues, probably the same as those which have, thou
perhaps less in the great cities, affected the average of ne
paper writing. In Europe the leading speakers and writ
have nearly all belonged to the cultivated classes, and, feeli
themselves raised above their audiences, have been in the ha
of obeying their own taste and that of their class rather th
the appetite of those whom they addressed. In England,
instance, the standard of speaking by public men has be
set by parliamentary debate, because till within the last f
decades the leading politicians of the country had all w
their reputation in Parliament. They carried their parliam
tary style with them into popular meetings, and aspirants
all classes imitated this style. It sometimes erred in be
too formal and too prolix; but its taste was good, and its v
plainness obliged the speaker to have solid matter. In Amer
on the other hand, stump oratory is older, or at least quite

l as, congressional oratory, and the latter has never gained
at hold on the ideas and habits of the people which parlia-
ntary debate held in England. Hence speaking has gener-
y moved on a somewhat lower level, not but what there
re brilliant popular orators in the first days of the Republic,
e Patrick Henry, and majestic parliamentary orators like
niel Webster in the next generation, but that the volume
stump speaking was so much greater than in England that
e fashion could not be set by a few of the greatest men, but
s determined by the capacities of the average man. The
te of the average man was not raised by the cultivated few
their own standard, but tended to lower the practice, and to
ne extent even the taste, of the cultivated few. To seem
ser or more refined than the multitude, to incur the suspi-
n of talking down to the multitude, and treating them as
eriors, would have offended the sentiment of the country,
l injured the prospects of a statesman. It is perhaps a
firmation of this view that, while pompousness has flour-
ed in the West, the most polished speakers have generally
onged to New England, where the level of average taste
l knowledge was exceptionally high. One of these speak-
, the late Mr. Wendell Phillips, was, in the opinion of com-
ent critics, an opinion which those who remember his
versation will be inclined to agree with, one of the first
tors of the present century, and not more remarkable for
finish than for the transparent simplicity of his style,
ich attained its highest effects by the most direct and
ural methods.

CHAPTER CXV

THE PLEASANTNESS OF AMERICAN LIFE

I HAVE never met a European of the upper or middle class who did not express astonishment when told that Amer was a more agreeable place than Europe to live in. "I working men," he would answer, "yes; but for men of edu tion or property, how can a new rough country, where nothi but business is talked and the refinements of life are only j beginning to appear, how can such a country be compar with England, or France, or Italy?"

It is nevertheless true that there are elements in the life the United States which may well make a European of a class prefer to dwell there rather than in the land of his bir Let us see what they are.

In the first place there is the general prosperity and ma rial well-being of the mass of the inhabitants. In Europe, an observer takes his eye off his own class and considers whole population of any one of the greater countries (fo except Switzerland and parts of Scandinavia and Portugal), will perceive that by far the greater number lead very labo ous lives, and are, if not actually in want of the necessities existence, yet liable to fall into want, the agriculturists wh nature is harsh, the wage-earners when work is scarce. England the lot of the labourer has been hitherto a hard o incessant field toil, with rheumatism at fifty and the wo house at the end of the vista; while the misery in such cit as London, Liverpool, and Glasgow is only too well know In France there is less pauperism, but nothing can be m pinched and sordid than the life of the bulk of the peasant In the great towns of Germany there is constant distress a increasing discontent. The riots of 1886 in Belgium told even more painful tale of the wretchedness of the miners a artisans there. In Italy the condition of the rural popu

on of Venetia as well as of the southern provinces seems
grow worse, and fills her statesmen with alarm. Of Russia,
ith her eighty millions of peasants living in half-barbarism,
ere is no need to speak. Contrast any one of these coun-
ies with the United States, where the working classes
e as well fed, clothed, and lodged as the lower middle
ass in Europe, and the farmers who till their own land
s nearly all do) much better, where a good education is
ithin the reach of the poorest, where the opportunities for
tting on in one way or another are so abundant that no
e need fear any physical ill but disease or the results of his
n intemperance. Pauperism already exists and increases
some of the larger cities, where drink breeds misery, and
here recent immigrants, with the shiftlessness of Europe
ill clinging round them, are huddled together in squalor.
t outside these few cities one sees nothing but comfort.
Connecticut and Massachusetts the operatives in many a
anufacturing town lead a life far easier, far more brightened
intellectual culture and by amusements, than that of the
rks and shopkeepers of England or France. In cities like
eveland or Chicago one finds miles on miles of suburb filled
th neat wooden houses, each with its tiny garden plot,
ned by the shop assistants and handicraftsmen who return
the horse-cars in the evening from their work. All over
e wide West, from Lake Ontario to the Upper Missouri, one
vels past farms of two to three hundred acres, in every
e of which there is a spacious farmhouse among orchards
d meadows, where the farmer's children grow up strong
d hearty on abundant food, the boys full of intelligence and
terprise, ready to push their way on farms of their own or
ter business in the nearest town, the girls familiar with the
rrent literature of England as well as of America. The
e of the new emigrant in the further West has its priva-
ns, but it is brightened by hope, and has a singular charm
freedom and simplicity. The impression which this com-
t and plenty makes is heightened by the brilliance and
enness of the air, by the look of freshness and cleanness
ich even the cities wear, all of them except the poorest parts
those few I have referred to above. The fog and soot-flakes
an English town, as well as its squalor, are wanting; you

are in a new world, and a world which knows the sun. It impossible not to feel warmed, cheered, invigorated by t sense of such material well-being all around one, impossib not to be infected by the buoyancy and hopefulness of t people. The wretchedness of Europe lies far behind; t weight of its problems seems lifted from the mind. As a m suffering from depression feels the clouds roll away from h spirit when he meets a friend whose good humour and ener present the better side of things and point the way throu difficulties, so the sanguine temper of the Americans, and t sight of the ardour with which they pursue their aims, sti ulates a European, and makes him think the world a bet place than it had seemed amid the entanglements and suff ings of his own hemisphere.

To some Europeans this may seem fanciful. I doubt if a European can realize till he has been in America how mu difference it makes to the happiness of any one not who devoid of sympathy with his fellow-beings, to feel that round him, in all classes of society and all parts of the cou try, there exist in such ample measure so many of the exter conditions of happiness: abundance of the necessaries of li easy command of education and books, amusements and leisu to enjoy them, comparatively few temptations to intemp ance and vice.

The second charm of American life is one which so Europeans will smile at. It is social equality. To ma Europeans — to Germans, let us say, or Englishmen — t word has an odious sound. It suggests a dirty fellow a blouse elbowing his betters in a crowd, or an ill-con tioned villager shaking his fist at the parson and the squi or, at any rate, it suggests obtrusiveness and bad manne The exact contrary is the truth. Equality improves manne for it strengthens the basis of all good manners, respect other men and women simply as men and women, irrespect of their station in life. Probably the assertion of soc equality was one of the causes which injured American m ners fifty years ago, for that they were then bad among tow folk can hardly be doubted in face of the testimony, not mer of sharp tongues like Mrs. Trollope's, but of calm observ like Sir Charles Lyell and sympathetic observers like Rich

bden.[1] In those days there was an obtrusive self-assertive-
ss among the less refined classes, especially towards those
ho, coming from the Old World, were assumed to come in a
tronizing spirit. Now, however, social equality has grown
naturally out of the circumstances of the country, has been
long established, and is so ungrudgingly admitted, that all
cuse for obtrusiveness has disappeared. People meet on a
nple and natural footing, with more frankness and ease than
possible in countries where every one is either looking up
looking down.[2] There is no servility on the part of the hum-
er, and if now and then a little of the "I am as good as
u" rudeness be perceptible, it is almost sure to proceed
om a recent immigrant, to whom the attitude of simple
uality has not yet become familiar as the evidently proper
itude of one man to another. There is no condescension
the part of the more highly placed, nor is there even that
rt of scrupulously polite coldness which one might think
ey would adopt in order to protect their dignity. They
ve no cause to fear for their dignity, so long as they do not
emselves forget it. And the fact that your shoemaker or
ur factory hand addresses you as an equal does not prevent
n from respecting, and showing his respect for, all such
periority as your birth or education or eminence in any
e of life may entitle you to receive.

This naturalness of intercourse is a distinct addition to the
easure of social life. It enlarges the circle of possible
endship, by removing the *gêne* which in most parts of
rope persons of different ranks feel in exchanging their

[1] Volney, who at the end of last century commented on the "incivilite
ionale," ascribes it "moins à un système d'intentions qu' à l'independance
uelle, à l'isolement, au défaut des besoins réciproques."

[2] A trifling anecdote may illustrate what I mean. In a small Far Western
n the stationmaster lent me a locomotive to run a few miles out along the
way to see a remarkable piece of scenery. The engine took me and dropped
here, as I wished to walk back, much to the surprise of the driver and stoker,
in America no one walks if he can help it. The same evening, as I was sit-
in the hall of the hotel, I was touched on the arm, and turning round found
elf accosted by a well-mannered man, who turned out to be the engine-
er. He expressed his regret that the locomotive had not been cleaner and
er "fixed up," as he would have liked to make my trip as agreeable as
ible, but the notice given him had been short. He talked with intelligence,
we had some pleasant chat together. It was fortunate that I had resisted
ne forenoon the British impulse to bestow a gratuity.

thoughts on any matters save those of business. It raises t
humbler classes without lowering the upper; indeed, it i
proves the upper no less than the lower by expunging th
latent insolence which deforms the manners of so many
the European rich. It relieves women in particular, w
in Europe are specially apt to think of class distinctio
from that sense of constraint and uneasiness which is produ
by the knowledge that other women with whom they come
contact are either looking down on them, or at any rate try
to gauge and determine their social position. It expands
range of a man's sympathies, and makes it easier for him
enter into the sentiments of other classes than his own.
gives a sense of solidarity to the whole nation, cutting away
ground for the jealousies and grudges which distract people
long as the social pretensions of past centuries linger on to
resisted and resented by the levelling spirit of a revolution
age. And I have never heard native Americans speak of a
drawbacks corresponding to and qualifying these benefits.

There are, moreover, other rancours besides those of soc
inequality whose absence from America brightens it to
European eye. There are no quarrels of churches and sec
Judah does not vex Ephraim, nor Ephraim envy Judah.
Established Church looks down scornfully upon Dissent
from the height of its titles and endowments, and talks
them as hindrances in the way of its work. No Dissent
pursue an Established Church in a spirit of watchful jealou
nor agitate for its overthrow. One is not offended by
contrast between the theory and the practice of a religion
peace, between professions of universal affection in pul
addresses and forms of prayer, and the acrimony of cler
controversialists. Still less, of course, is there that sh
opposition and antagonism of Christians and anti-Christi
which lacerates the private as well as public life of Fran
Rivalry between sects appears only in the innocent form
the planting of new churches and raising of funds for m
sionary objects, while most of the Protestant denominatio
including the four most numerous, constantly fraternize
charitable work. Between Roman Catholics and the m
educated Protestants there is little hostility, and sometim
even co-operation for a philanthropic purpose. The sce

no longer under a social ban, and discussions on the essen-
als of Christianity and of theism are conducted with good
mper. There is not a country in the world where Frederick
ie Great's principle, that every one should be allowed to go
heaven his own way, is so fully applied. This sense of
ligious peace as well as religious freedom all around one is
othing to the weary European, and contributes not a little
sweeten the lives of ordinary people.

I come last to the character and ways of the Americans
iemselves, in which there is a certain charm, hard to convey
description, but felt almost as soon as one sets foot on their
iore, and felt constantly thereafter. They are a kindly
eople. Good nature, heartiness, a readiness to render small
rvices to one another, an assumption that neighbours in the
untry, or persons thrown together in travel, or even in a
owd, were meant to be friendly rather than hostile to one
nother, seem to be everywhere in the air, and in those who
reathe it. Sociability is the rule, isolation and moroseness
ie rare exception. It is not merely that people are more
vacious or talkative than an Englishman expects to find
iem, for the Western man is often taciturn and seldom
reathes his long face into a smile. It is rather that you feel
at the man next you, whether silent or talkative, does not
ean to repel intercourse, or convey by his manner his low
inion of his fellow-creatures. Everybody seems disposed
think well of the world and its inhabitants, well enough at
ast to wish to be on easy terms with them and serve them
those little things whose trouble to the doer is small in
oportion to the pleasure they give to the receiver. To help
hers is better recognized as a duty than in Europe. No-
iere is money so readily given for any public purpose;
where, I suspect, are there so many acts of private kindness
ne, such, for instance, as paying the college expenses of a
omising boy, or aiding a widow to carry on her husband's
rm; and these are not done with ostentation. People seem
take their own troubles more lightly than they do in
irope, and to be more indulgent to the faults by which
ubles are caused. It is a land of hope, and a land of hope
a land of good humour. And they have also, though this
a quality more perceptible in women than in men, a re-

markable faculty for enjoyment, a power of drawing mo
happiness from obvious pleasures, simple and innocent plea
ures, than one often finds in overburdened Europe.

As generalizations like this are necessarily comparative,
may be asked with whom I am comparing the American
With the English, or with some attempted average of Eur
pean nations? Primarily I am comparing them with the En
lish, because they are the nearest relatives of the Englis
But there are other European countries, such as France, Be
gium, Spain, in which the sort of cheerful friendliness I ha
sought to describe is less common than it is in Americ
Even in Germany and German Austria, simple and kindly
are the masses of the people, the upper classes have th
roideur which belongs to countries dominated by an old ari
tocracy, or by a plutocracy trying to imitate aristocrat
ways. The upper class in America (if one may use such
expression) has not in this respect differentiated itself fro
the character of the nation at large.

If the view here presented be a true one, to what caus
are we to ascribe this agreeable development of the origin
English type, a development in whose course the sadness
Puritanism seems to have been shed off?

Perhaps one of them is the humorous turn of the Americ
character. Humour is a sweetener of temper, a copious spri
of charity, for it makes the good side of bad things even mo
visible than the weak side of good things; but humour
Americans may be as much a result of an easy and kind
turn as their kindliness is of their humour. Another is t
perpetuation of a habit of mutual help formed in colon
days. Colonists need one another's aid more constantly th
the dwellers in an old country, are thrown more upon o
another, even when they live scattered in woods or prairi
are more interested in one another's welfare. When y
have only three neighbours within five miles, each of the
covers a large part of your horizon. You want to borrow
plough from one; you get another to help you to roll yo
logs; your children's delight is to go over for an evening
merrymaking to the lads and lasses of the third. It is mu
pleasanter to be on good terms with these few neighbours, a
when others come one by one, they fall into the same hab

f intimacy. Any one who has read those stories of rustic
Jew England or New York life which delighted the English
hildren of forty years ago — I do not know whether they
elight children still, or have been thrown aside for more
ighly spiced food — will remember the warm-hearted simplic-
y and atmosphere of genial good-will which softened the
oughness of peasant manners and tempered the sternness of
Calvinistic creed. It is natural that the freedom of inter-
ourse and sense of interdependence which existed among the
arly settlers, and which have always existed since among
ie pioneers of colonization in the West as they moved from
ie Connecticut to the Mohawk, from the Mohawk to the Ohio,
om the Ohio to the Mississppi, should have left on the
ational character traces not effaced even in the more artificial
ivilization of our own time. Something may be set down to
ie feeling of social equality, creating that respect for a man
s a man, whether he be rich or poor, which was described a
ew pages back; and something to a regard for the sentiment
f the multitude, a sentiment which forbids any man to stand
oof in the conceit of self-importance, and holds up geniality
nd good fellowship as almost the first of social virtues. I
o not mean that a man consciously suppresses his impulses
o selfishness or gruffness because he knows that his faults
ill be ill regarded; but that, having grown up in a society
hich is infinitely powerful as compared with the most power-
l person in it, he has learnt to realize his individual insig-
ficance, as members of the upper class in Europe never do,
nd has become permeated by the feeling which this society
ntertains — that each one's duty is not only to accept equal-
y, but also to relish equality, and to make himself pleasant
his equals. Thus the habit is formed even in natures of no
ecial sweetness, and men become kindly by doing kindly acts.
Whether, however, these suggestions be right or wrong,
ere is no doubt as to the fact which they attempt to explain.
do not, of course, give it merely as the casual impression of
uropean visitors, whom a singularly frank and ready hospi-
lity welcomes and makes much of. I base it on the reports
European friends who have lived for years in the United
ates, and whose criticism of the ways and notions of the peo-
e is keen enough to show that they are no partial witnesses.

CHAPTER CXVI

THE UNIFORMITY OF AMERICAN LIFE

To the pleasantness of American life there is one, and perha only one, serious drawback — its uniformity. Those who ha been struck by the size of America, and by what they have hea of its restless excitement, may be surprised at the word. Th would have guessed that an unquiet changefulness and turm were the disagreeables to be feared. But uniformity, which t European visitor begins to note when he has travelled for month or two, is the feature of the country which Englishm who have lived long there, and Americans who are famili with Europe, most frequently revert to when asked to s what is the "crook in their lot."

It is felt in many ways. I will name a few.

It is felt in the aspects of nature. All the natural featu of the United States are on a larger scale than those of Euro The four chief mountain chains are each of them longer th the Alps.[1] Of the gigantic rivers and of those inland seas call the Great Lakes one need not speak. The centre of t continent is occupied by a plain larger than the western h of Europe. In the Mississippi valley, from the Gulf of Mex to Lake Superior, there is nothing deserving to be called a h though, as one moves westward from the great river, long s undulations in the boundless prairie begin to appear. Throu vast stretches of country one finds the same physical charac maintained with little change — the same strata, the same ve tation, a generally similar climate. From the point where y leave the Alleghanies at Pittsburg, until after crossing Missouri, you approach the still untilled prairie of the We

[1] The Alleghanies, continued in the Green and White Mountains, the Ro Mountains, the Sierra Nevada continued in the Cascade Range, and the C Range which borders the Pacific.

ailway run of some thousand miles, there is a uniformity of ıdscape greater than could be found along any one hundred les of railway run in Western Europe. Everywhere the ne nearly flat country, over which you cannot see far, be- ıse you are little raised above it, the same fields and crops, e same rough wooden fences, the same thickets of the same shes along the stream edges, with here and there a bit of forest; the same solitary farmhouses and straggling wood- lt villages. And when one has passed beyond the fields l farmhouses, there is an even more unvaried stretch of ghtly rolling prairie, smooth and bare, till after five hun- d miles the blue line of the Rocky Mountains rises upon western horizon.

There are some extraordinary natural phenomena, such as agara, the Yellowstone Geysers, and the great cañon of the orado River, which Europe cannot equal. But taking the ntry as a whole, and remembering that it is a continent, it ot more rich in picturesque beauty than the much smaller stern half of Europe. The long Alleghany range contains ood deal of pretty scenery and a few really romantic spots, hardly anything so charming as the best bits of Scotland Southern Ireland, or the English Lake country. The Rocky untains are pierced by some splendid gorges, such as the ous cañon of the Arkansas River above South Pueblo, and w some very grand prospects, such as that over the Great t Lake from the Mormon capital. But neither the Rocky untains, with their dependent ranges, nor the Sierra vada, can be compared for variety of grandeur and beauty h the Alps; for although each chain nearly equals the Alps height, and covers a greater area, they have little snow, no ciers,[1] and a singular uniformity of character. One finds, ink, less variety in the whole chain of the Rockies than in comparatively short Pyrenees. There are, indeed, in the ole United States very few quite first-rate pieces of moun- scenery rivalling the best of the Old World. The most ressive are two or three of the deep valleys of the Sierra vada (of which the Yosemite is the best known), and the erb line of extinct volcanoes, bearing snow-fields and

[1] There are a few inconsiderable glaciers in the northernmost part of the ky Mountains, and a small one on Mount Shasta.

glaciers, which one sees, rising out of vast and sombre fore from the banks of the Columbia River and the shores of Pu Sound.[1] So the Atlantic coast, though there are charm bits between Newport and the New Brunswick frontier, c not vie with the coasts of Scotland, Ireland, or Norw while southward from New York to Florida it is everywh flat and often dreary. In the United States people t journeys proportionate to the size of the country. A fan thinks nothing of going twelve hundred miles, from St. Lo to Cape May (near Philadelphia), for a seaside holiday. even journeys of twelve hundred miles do not give an Am can so much change of scene and variety of surroundings a Parisian has when he goes to Nice, or a Berliner to Berch gaden. The man who lives in the section of America wh seems destined to contain the largest population, I mean States on the Upper Mississippi, lives in the midst of a pl wider than the plains of Russia, and must travel hundred miles to escape from its monotony.

When we turn from the aspects of nature to the cities men, the uniformity is even more remarkable. With eigh nine exceptions to be mentioned presently, American ci differ from one another only herein, that some of them built more with brick than with wood, and others more w wood than with brick. In all else they are alike, both g and small. In all the same wide streets, crossing at ri angles, ill-paved, but planted along the sidewalks with ma trees whose autumnal scarlet surpasses the brilliance of European foliage.[2] In all the same shops, arranged on

[1] I have been obliged by want of space to omit the chapters which intended to describe the scenery of the United States and conjecture its able future influence on the character of the people.

Nothing is further from my mind than to attempt to disparage the sce of the Great West, which contains, from the eastern slope of the Rocky M tains to the Pacific, many very striking and impressive points. I only that they are less beautiful than the Alps, just as the mountains of Minor, even when equal or superior in height, are less beautiful, and la for the same reason. They are much drier, and have therefore fewer str and less variety and wealth of vegetation, the upper zone of the S Nevada excepted; and the Rockies, as they run north and south, present of a contrast between their two sides than do the northern and sou declivities of the Alps or the Caucasus.

[2] In the newer cities one set of parallel streets is named by numbers others, which cross them at right angles, are in some instances, as in

me plan, the same Chinese laundries, with Li Kow visible rough the window, the same ice-cream stores, the same rge hotels with seedy men hovering about in the cheerless trance-hall, the same street cars passing to and fro with ssengers clinging to the door-step, the same locomotives nging their great bells as they clank slowly down the middle the street. I admit that in external aspect there is a sad onotony in the larger towns of England also. Compare Eng-h cities with Italian cities, and most of the former seem e one another, incapable of being, so to speak, individualized you individualize a man with a definite character and aspect like that of other men. Take the Lancashire towns, for stance, large and prosperous places. You cannot individu-ze Bolton or Wigan, Oldham or Bury, except by trying to member that Bury is slightly less rough than Oldham, and igan a thought more grimy than Bolton. But in Italy every y has its character, its memories, its life and achievements ought into the pillars of its churches and the towers that nd along its ramparts. Siena is not like Perugia, nor rugia like Orvieto; Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Ancona, imo, standing along the same coast within seventy miles of e another, have each of them a character, a sentiment, what e may call an idiosyncrasy, which comes vividly back to us the mention of its name. Now, what English towns are Italian, that American towns are to English. They are in ne ways pleasanter; they are cleaner, there is less poverty, s squalor, less darkness. But their monotony haunts one e a nightmare. Even the irksomeness of finding the streets ned by numbers becomes insufferable. It is doubtless con-ient to know by the number how far up the city the par-ılar street is. But you cannot give any sort of character Twenty-ninth Street, for the name refuses to lend itself to association. There is something wearisomely hard and e in such a system.

return joyfully to the exceptions. Boston has a character her own, with her beautiful Common, her smooth environ-waters, her Beacon Hill crowned by the gilded dome of the

k, called avenues, and so numbered. In Washington the avenues are d after States, and of the two sets of streets (which the avenues cross quely), one is called by numbers, the other by the letters of the alphabet.

State House, and Bunker Hill, bearing the monument of
famous fight. New York, besides a magnificent position,
in the grandeur of the buildings and the tremendous rush
men and vehicles along the streets as much the air of a gr
capital as London itself. Chicago, with her enormous size a
the splendid warehouses that line her endless thoroughfa
now covered by a dense smoke pall, leaves a strong though
wholly agreeable impression. Richmond has a quaint
world look which dwells in the memory; few cities hav
sea front equal in beauty to the lake front of Cleveland. Wa
ington, with its wide and beautifully graded avenues, and
glittering white of the stately Capitol, has become within
last twenty years a singularly handsome city. Charleston
the air of an English town of last century, though lapped i
far richer vegetation, and with the shining softness of sum
seas spread out before it. And New Orleans — or rather
Creole quarter of New Orleans, for the rest of the city is c
monplace — is delicious, suggesting old France and Spain,
a France and Spain strangely transmuted in this new cli
I have seen nothing in America more picturesque than
Rue Royale, with its houses of all heights, often built ro
a courtyard, where a magnolia or an orange-tree stands in
middle, and wooden external staircases lead up to wooden
leries, the house fronts painted of all colours, and carry
double rows of balconies decorated with pretty ironwork,
whole standing languid and still in the warm soft air,
touched with the subtle fragrance of decay. Here in N
Orleans the streets and public buildings, and specially the
City Hall, with the arms of Spain still upon it, speak of hist
One feels, in stepping across Canal Street from the Cr
quarter to the business parts of the town, that one steps f
an old nationality to a new one, that this city must have
vicissitudes, that it represents something, and that someth
one of the great events of history, the surrender of the nort
half of the New World by the Romano-Celtic races to
Teutonic. Quebec, and to a less degree Montreal, fifteen
dred miles away, tell the same tale; Santa Fé in New Me
repeats it.

It is the absence in nearly all the American cities of anyth
that speaks of the past that makes their external aspect so

ggestive. In pacing their busy streets and admiring their ndsome city halls and churches, one's heart sinks at the feel- g that nothing historically interesting ever has happened here, rhaps ever will happen. In many an English town, however ly with its smoke and its new suburbs, one sees at least an cient church, one can discover some fragments of a castle a city wall. Even Wigan and Northampton have ancient urches, though Northampton lately allowed the North-west- n Railway to destroy the last traces of the castle where enry II. issued his Assize. But in America hardly any blic building is associated with anything more interesting an a big party convention; and, nowadays, even the big nventions are held in temporary structures, whose materials e sold when the politicians have dispersed. Nowhere, per- ps, does this sense of the absolute novelty of all things ike one so strongly as in San Francisco. Few cities in the rld can vie with her either in the beauty or in the natural vantages of her situation; indeed, there are only three places Europe — Constantinople, Corinth, and Gibraltar — that com- ne an equally perfect landscape with what may be called an ually imperial position. Before you there is the magnificent y, with its far-stretching arms and rocky isles, and beyond it e faint line of the Sierra Nevada, cutting the clear air e mother-of-pearl; behind there is the roll of the ocean; to e left, the majestic gateway between mountains through ich ships bear in commerce from the farthest shores of the cific; to the right, valleys rich with corn and wine, sweep- ; away to the southern horizon. The city itself is full of d hills, rising steeply from the deep water. The air is en, dry, and bright, like the air of Greece, and the waters less blue. Perhaps it is this air and light, recalling the es of the Mediterranean, that make one involuntarily look to the top of these hills for the feudal castle, or the ruins the Acropolis, which one thinks must crown them. I found self so looking all the time I remained in the city. But on ne of these heights is there anything more interesting, any- ng more vocal to the student of the past, than the sumptu- villas of the magnates of the Central Pacific Railway, who ve chosen a hill-top to display their wealth to the city, but re erected houses like all other houses, only larger. San

Francisco has had a good deal of history in her fifty years
life; but this history does not, like that of Greece or Ita
write itself in stone, or even in wood.

Of the uniformity of political institutions over the wh
United States I have spoken already. Everywhere the sa
system of State governments, everywhere the same municip
governments, and almost uniformly bad or good in proporti
to the greater or smaller population of the city; the same pa
machinery organized on the same methods, "run" by the sa
wirepullers and "workers." In rural local government the
are some diversities in the names, areas, and functions of t
different bodies, yet differences slight in comparison with t
points of likeness. The schools are practically identical
organization, in the subjects taught, in the methods of tea
ing, though the administration of them is as completely
centralized as can be imagined, even the State commissio
having no right to do more than suggest or report. So it
with the charitable institutions, with the libraries, the lectu
courses, the public amusements. All these are more abunda
and better of their kind in the richer and more cultivated pa
of the country, generally better in the North Atlantic than
the inland States, and in the West than in the South. B
they are the same in type everywhere. It is the same wi
social habits and usages. There are still some differenc
between the South and the North; and in the Eastern cit
the upper class is more Europeanized in its code of etique
and its ways of daily life. But even these variations tend
disappear. Eastern customs begin to permeate the West,
ginning with the richer families; the South is more like t
North than it was before the war. Travel where you wi
you feel that what you have found in one place that you w
find in another. The thing which hath been, will be: y
can no more escape from it than you can quit the land to li
in the sea.

Last of all we come to man himself — to man and to woma
not less important than man. The ideas of men and wom
their fundamental beliefs and their superficial tastes, th
methods of thinking and their fashions of talking, are wh
most concern their fellow-men; and if there be variety a
freshness in these, the uniformity of nature and the monoto

f cities signify but little. If I observe that in these respects so the similarity of type over the country is surprising, I nall be asked whether I am not making the old mistake of the an who fancied all Chinese were like one another, because, oticing the dress and the pigtail, he did not notice minor ifferences of feature. A scholar is apt to think that all usiness men write the same hand, and a business man thinks ne same of all scholars. Perhaps Americans think all Engshmen alike. And I may also be asked with whom I am mparing the Americans. With Europe as a whole? If , is it not absurd to expect that the differences between ifferent sections in one people should be as marked as those etween different peoples? The United States are larger than urope, but Europe has many races and many languages, among hom contrasts far broader must be expected than between one eople, even if it stretches over a continent.

It is most clearly not with Europe, but with each of the ading European peoples that we must compare the people America. So comparing them with the peoples of Britain, rance, Germany, Italy, Spain, one discovers more varieties tween individuals in these European peoples than one finds America. Scotchmen and Irishmen are more unlike Engshmen, the native of Normandy more unlike the native of rovence, the Pomeranian more unlike the Wurtemberger, the edmontese more unlike the Neapolitan, the Basque more like the Andalusian, than the American from any part of e country is to the American from any other. Differences course there are between the human type as developed in fferent regions of the country, — differences moral and intelctual as well as physical. You can generally tell a Southner by his look as well as by his speech, and the South, as a nole, has a character of its own, propagated from the older lantic to the newer Western States. A native of Maine ll probably differ from a native of Kentucky, a Georgian om an Oregonian. But these differences strike even an nerican observer much as the difference between a Yorkreman and a Warwickshire man strikes the English, and is ghter than the contrast between a middle-class southern Engman and a middle-class Scotchman, slighter than the differes between a peasant from Northumberland and a peasant

from Dorsetshire. Or, to take another way of putting it: If some great gathering of a political party from all parts of th United Kingdom you were to go round and talk to, say, on hundred, taken at random, of the persons present, you would struck by more diversity between the notions and tastes an mental habits of the individuals comprising that one hundre than if you tried the same experiment with a hundred Amer cans of similar education and position, similarly gathered in convention from every State in the Union.

I do not in the least mean that people are more commonpla in America than in England, or that the Americans are le ideal than the English. Neither of these statements wou be true. On the contrary, the average American is more ali to new ideas, more easily touched through his imagination his emotions, than the average Englishman or Frenchman. H has a keen sense of humour, and an unquenchable faith in th future. I mean only that the native-born Americans appear vary less, in fundamentals, from what may be called the dom nant American type than Englishmen, Germans, Frenchme Spaniards, or Italians do from any type which could be taken the dominant type in any of those nations. Or, to put the sam thing differently, it is rather more difficult to take any asse blage of attributes in any of these European countries and call the national type than it is to do the like in the United State

These are not given as the impressions of a traveller. Su impressions, being necessarily hasty, and founded on a co paratively narrow observation, would deserve little confiden They sum up the conclusions of Europeans long resident America, and familiar with different parts of the count They are, I think, admitted by the most acute America themselves. I have often heard the latter dilate on what seer to them the one crowning merit of life in Europe — the varie it affords, the opportunities it gives of easy and complete chang of scene and environment. The pleasure which an Americ finds in crossing the Atlantic, a pleasure more intense th any which the European enjoys, is that of passing from a la of happy monotony into regions where everything is redole with memories of the past, and derives from the past no l than from the present a wealth and a subtle complexity interest which no new country can possess.

Life in America is in most ways pleasanter, easier, simpler an in Europe; it floats in a sense of happiness like that of a diant summer morning. But life in any of the great Euro- an centres is capable of an intensity, a richness blended of any elements, which has not yet been reached in America. here are more problems in Europe calling for solution; there more passion in the struggles that rage round them; the st more frequently kindles the present with a glow of imagi- tive light. In whichever country of Europe one dwells, e feels that the other countries are near, that the fortunes their peoples are bound up with the fortunes of one's own, at ideas are shooting to and fro between them. The web of story woven day by day all over Europe is vast and of many lours: it is fateful to every European. But in America it is ly the philosopher who can feel that it will ultimately be eful to Americans also; to the ordinary man the Old World ems far off, severed by a dissociating ocean, its mighty rden with little meaning for him.

Those who have observed the uniformity I have been attempt- g to describe have commonly set it down, as Europeans do st American phenomena, to what they call Democracy. mocratic government has in reality not much to do with it, cept in so far as such a government helps to induce that ference of individuals to the mass which strengthens a minant type, whether of ideas, of institutions, or of man- rs. More must be ascribed to the equality of material con- ions, still more general than in Europe, to the fact that arly every one is engaged either in agriculture, or in com- rce, or in some handicraft, to the extraordinary mobility of e population, which, in migrating from one part of the ntry to another, brings the characteristics of each part into e others, to the diffusion of education, to the cheapness of erature and universal habit of reading, which enable every e to know what every one else is thinking, but above all, the newness of the country, and the fact that four-fifths of have been made all at a stroke, and therefore all of a piece, compared with the slow growth by which European coun- es have developed. Newness is the cause of uniformity, not rely in the external aspect of cities, villages, farmhouses, in other things also, for the institutions and social habits

which belonged a century ago to a group of small communiti on the Atlantic coast, have been suddenly extended over immense area, each band of settlers naturally seeking to reta its customs, and to plant in the new soil shoots from whi trees like those of the old home might spring up. The varie of European countries is due, not only to the fact that th race-elements have not yet become thoroughly commingl but also that many old institutions have survived among t new ones; as in a city that grows but slowly, old buildin are not cleared away to make room for others more suited modern commerce, but are allowed to stand, sometimes emp and unused, sometimes half adapted to new purposes. T scarcely happens in America. Doubtless many Americ institutions are old, and were old before they were carri across the Atlantic. But they have generally received a n dress, which, in adapting them to the needs of to-day, conce their ancient character; and the form in which they have be diffused or reproduced in the different States of the Union in all those States practically identical.

In each of the great European countries the diversity primeval and mediæval times, when endless varieties of ra speech, and faith existed within the space of a few hundr miles, has been more or less preserved by segregative inf ences. In America a small race, of the same speech and fai has spread itself out over a vast area, and has hitherto be strong enough to impose its own type, not only on the Dut and other early settlers of the Middle States, but on the imm grant masses who began to arrive in the middle of this centu

There are now in America more Irish people, and childr of Irish people, than there are in Ireland; while large tra in the country and some of the cities are in speech rath German than American, so much so that public docume are issued in both tongues.[1] Yet neither the Celtic nor Teutonic incomers have substantially affected the natio character and habits, though the latter may be credited w much of the growing taste for music and the drama, as w

[1] In the presidential contest of 1892 "campaign documents" were publis by the Democratic National Committee in German, French, Italian, Swed Norse, Polish, Dutch, Welsh, and Hebrew; and newspapers were distribu printed in Czech, Hungarian, and Spanish.

s with the progress of latitudinarianism in religion. Whether he host of immigrants who have recently arrived, and in particular, the backward races from Central Europe whom the st fifteen years have brought, will be as easily absorbed, and hether they will, in the process, injure the absorbing organism — these are questions which must remain unanswered for least another generation. So far as our present data enable prediction to be made, they point to the permanent predominence of the native type, though possibly with some slight odifications.

May one, then, expect that when novelty has worn off, and merica counts her life by centuries instead of by decades, ariety will develop itself, and such complexities, or diversies, or incongruities (whichever one is to call them) as European countries present, be deeper and more numerous?

As regards the outside of things, this seems unlikely. Many the small towns of to-day will grow into large towns, a few the large towns into great cities, but as they grow, they ll not become less like one another. There will be larger eatres and hotels, more churches (in spite of secularist lecters) and handsomer ones; but what is to make the theatres d churches of one city differ from those of another? Fashion d the immense facilities of intercourse tend to wear down en such diversities in the style of building or furnishing, in modes of locomotion, or in amusements and forms of cial intercourse, as now exist.

As regards ideas and the inner life of men, the question is nore difficult one. At present there are only two parts of e country where one looks to meet with the well-marked lividualities I refer to. One of these is New England, here the spirit of Puritanism, expressed in new literary rms by Emerson and his associates, did produce a peculiar pe of thinking and discoursing, which has now, however, nost died out; and where one still meets, especially among e cultivated classes, a larger number than elsewhere of rsons who have thought and studied for themselves, and are like their fellows.[1] The other part of the country is the

[1] The old-fashioned Puritan farmer has, however, almost vanished from ssachusetts; when he went West, attracted by the greater richness of the , Irishmen came in his place.

Far West, where the wild life led by pioneers in exploratio or ranching, or gold-mining has produced a number of strikir figures, men of extraordinary self-reliance, with a curiou mixture of geniality and reckless hardihood, no less indiffe ent to their own lives than to the lives of others. Of pr serving this latter type there is, alas, little hope; the swi march of civilization will have expunged it in thirty yea more.

When one sees millions of people thinking the same though and reading the same books, and perceives that as the mult tude grows, its influence becomes always stronger, it is ha to imagine how new points of repulsion and contrast are arise, new diversities of sentiment and doctrine to be dev oped. Nevertheless there is reason to believe that as t intellectual proficiency and speculative play of mind whi are now confined to a comparatively small class become mo generally diffused, as the pressure of effort towards materi success is relaxed, as the number of men devoted to scienc art, and learning increases, so will the dominance of what m be called the business mind decline, and with a richer varie of knowledge, tastes, and pursuits, there will come also larger crop of marked individualities, and of divergent int lectual types.

Time will take away some of the monotony which com from the absence of historical associations: for even if, as to be hoped, there comes no war to make battlefields famc like those of thirty years ago, yet literature and the lives famous men cannot but attach to many spots associations which the blue of distance will at last give a romantic int est. No people could be more ready than are the America to cherish such associations. Their country has a short pa but they willingly revere and preserve all the memories t past has bequeathed to them.

CHAPTER CXVII

THE TEMPER OF THE WEST

Western America is one of the most interesting subjects f study the modern world has seen. There has been nothing the past resembling its growth, and probably there will be othing in the future. A vast territory, wonderfully rich in atural resources of many kinds; a temperate and healthy imate, fit for European labour; a soil generally, and in many aces marvellously, fertile; in some regions mountains full of inerals, in others trackless forests where every tree is over vo hundred feet high; and the whole of this virtually unoccued territory thrown open to an energetic race, with all the pliances and contrivances of modern science at its command, these are phenomena absolutely without precedent in hisry, and which cannot recur elsewhere, because our planet ntains no such other favoured tract of country.

The Spaniards and Portuguese settled in tropical countries, hich soon enervated them. They carried with them the ison of slavery; their colonists were separated, some by ng land journeys, and all by still longer voyages from the ntres of civilization. But the railway and the telegraph llow the Western American. The Greeks of the sixth and venth centuries before Christ, who planted themselves all und the coasts of the Mediterranean, had always enemies, d often powerful enemies, to overcome before they could und even their trading-stations on the coast, much less occupy e lands of the interior. In Western America the presence the Indians has done no more than give a touch of romance a spice of danger to the exploration of some regions, such as estern Dakota and Arizona, while over the rest of the coun- the unhappy aborigines have slunk silently away, scarcely en complaining of the robbery of lands and the violation of

plighted faith. Nature and time seem to have conspired t make the development of the Mississippi basin and the Pacif slope the swiftest, easiest, completest achievement in the whol record of the civilizing progress of mankind since the founde of the Egyptian monarchy gathered the tribes of the Nile unde one government.

The details of this development and the statistics that illu trate it have been too often set forth to need re-statemer here. It is of the character and temper of the men who hav conducted it that I wish to speak, a matter which has receive less attention, but is essential to a just conception of th Americans of to-day. For the West is the most American pa of America; that is to say, the part where those features whic distinguish America from Europe come out in the stronge relief. What Europe is to Asia, what England is to the re of Europe, what America is to England, that the Weste States and Territories are to the Atlantic States, the heat ar pressure and hurry of life always growing as we follow th path of the sun. In Eastern America there are still qui spots, in the valleys of the Alleghanies, for instance, in nool of old New England, in university towns like Ithaca or An Arbor. In the West there are none. All is bustle, motio and struggle, most so of course among the native American yet even the immigrant from the secluded valleys of Thuringi or the shores of some Norwegian fjord, learns the ways almo as readily as the tongue of the country, and is soon swept in the whirlpool.

It is the most enterprising and unsettled Americans th come West; and when they have left their old haunts, brok their old ties, resigned the comforts and pleasures of the former homes, they are resolved to obtain the wealth and su cess for which they have come. They throw themselves in work with a feverish yet sustained intensity. They rise earl they work all day, they have few pleasures, few opportunit for relaxation.[1] I remember in the young city of Seattle Puget Sound to have found business in full swing at sev

[1] In the newer towns, which are often nothing more than groups of shan with a large hotel, a bank, a church, and inn, some drinking-saloons and ga bling-houses, there are few women and no homes. Everybody, except rec immigrants, Chinese, and the very poorest native Americans, lives in hotel.

clock A.M.: the shops open, the streets full of people. verything is speculative, land (or, as it is usually called, "real tate") most so, the value of lots of ground rising or falling erhaps two or three hundred per cent in the year. No one as any fixed occupation; he is a storekeeper to-day, a ranch- an to-morrow, a miner next week. I found the waiters in e chief hotel at Denver, in Colorado, saving their autumn d winter wages to start off in the spring "prospecting" for lver "claims" in the mountains. Few men stay in one of e newer cities more than a few weeks or months; to have en there a whole year is to be an old inhabitant, an oracle if u have succeeded, a by-word if you have not, for to prosper the West you must be able to turn your hand to anything, d seize the chance to-day which every one else will have en to-morrow. This venturesome and shifting life strengthens e reckless and heedless habits of the people. Every one inks so much of gaining that he thinks little of spending, d in the general dearness of commodities, food (in the agri- ltural districts) excepted, it seems not worth while to care out small sums. In California for many years no coin lower an a ten-cent piece (5d.) was in circulation; and even in 81, though most articles of food were abundant, nothing was ld at a lower price than five cents. The most striking alter- tions of fortune, the great *coups* which fascinate men and ake them play for all or nothing, are of course commoner in ning regions than elsewhere.[1] But money is everywhere so luable for the purposes of speculative investment, whether land, live stock, or trade, as to fetch very high interest. Walla Walla (in what was then the Territory of Washing- n) I found in 1881 that the interest on debts secured on od safe mortgages was at the rate of fourteen per cent per num, of course payable monthly.

The carelessness is public as well as private. Tree stumps e left standing in the streets of a large and flourishing town e Leadville, because the municipal authorities cannot be at e trouble of cutting or burning them. Swamps are left drained in the suburbs of a populous city like Portland,

[1] In California in 1881 I was shown an estate of 600,000 acres which was said ave been lately bought for $225,000 (£45,000) by a man who had made his une in two years' mining, having come out without a penny.

which every autumn breed malarious fevers; and the risk
accidents to be followed by actions does not prevent the ra
ways from pushing on their lines along loosely heaped emban
ments, and over curved trestle bridges which seem as if th
could not stand a high wind or the passage of a heavy train.

This mixture of science and rudeness is one of a series
singular contrasts which runs through the West, not less co
spicuous in the minds of the people than in their surrounding
They value good government, and have a remarkable facul
for organizing some kind of government, but they are tolera
of lawlessness which does not directly attack their own int
est. Horse-stealing and insults to women are the two unpa
donable offences; all others are often suffered to go unpunishe
I was in a considerable Western city, with a population
70,000 people, some years ago, when the leading newspaper
the place, commenting on one of the train robberies that h
been frequent in the State, observed that so long as the brigan
had confined themselves to robbing the railway companies a
the express companies of property for whose loss the compan
must answer, no one had greatly cared, seeing that these co
panies themselves robbed the public; but now that priv
citizens seemed in danger of losing their personal baggage a
money, the prosperity of the city might be compromised, a
something ought to be done — a sentiment delivered with
gravity, as the rest of the article showed.[1] Brigandage ter
to disappear when the country becomes populous, though th
are places in comparatively old States like Illinois and M
souri where the railways are still unsafe. But the sa
heedlessness suffers other evils to take root, evils likely
prove permanent, including some refinements of politi
roguery which it is strange to find amid the simple life
forests and prairies.

Another such contrast is presented by the tendency of t
shrewd and educated people to relapse into the oldest and m
childish forms of superstition. Fortune-telling, clairvoyan
attempts to pry by the help of "mediums" into the book
fate, are so common in parts of the West that the newspap

[1] This makes plausible the story of the Texas judge who allowed murde
to escape on points of law till he found the value of real estate declining, w
he saw to it that the next few offenders were hanged.

evote a special column, headed "astrologers," to the adver-sements of these wizards and pythonesses.[1] I have counted n one issue of a San Francisco newspaper as many as eighteen uch advertisements, six of which were of simple fortune-llers, like those who used to beguile the peasant girls of Devonshire. In fact, the profession of a soothsayer or astrol-ger is a recognized one in California now, as it was in the reece of Homer. Possibly the prevalence of mining specu-tion, possibly the existence of a large mass of ignorant nmigrants from Europe, may help to account for the phe-omenon, which, as California is deemed an exceptionally nreligious State, illustrates the famous saying that the less ith the more superstition.

All the passionate eagerness, all the strenuous effort of the Westerns is directed towards the material development of the ountry. To open the greatest number of mines and extract he greatest quantity of ore, to scatter cattle over a thousand lls, to turn the flower-spangled prairies of the North-west to wheat-fields, to cover the sunny slopes of the South-west ith vines and olives: this is the end and aim of their lives, is is their daily and nightly thought —

> "juvat Ismara Baccho
> Conserere atque olea magnum vestire Taburnum."

he passion is so absorbing, and so covers the horizon of public well as private life that it almost ceases to be selfish — it kes from its very vastness a tinge of ideality. To have an mmense production of exchangeable commodities, to force om nature the most she can be made to yield, and send it east d west by the cheapest routes to the dearest markets, mak-g one's city a centre of trade, and raising the price of its al estate — this, which might not have seemed a glorious nsummation to Isaiah or Plato, is preached by Western wspapers as a kind of religion. It is not really, or at least is not wholly, sordid. These people are intoxicated by the ajestic scale of the nature in which their lot is cast, enormous neral deposits, boundless prairies, forests which, even squan-red — wickedly squandered — as they now are, will supply

[1] Ohio in 1883 imposed a licence tax of $300 a year on "astrologers, fortune-ers, clairvoyants, palmisters, and seers."

timber to the United States for centuries; a soil which, wi
the rudest cultivation, yields the most abundant crops, a pop
lous continent for their market. They see all round them ra
ways being built, telegraph wires laid, steamboat lines acr
the Pacific projected, cities springing up in the solitudes, a
settlers making the wilderness to blossom like the rose. The
imagination revels in these sights and signs of progress, a
they gild their own struggles for fortune with the belief th
they are the missionaries of civilization and the instruments
Providence in the greatest work the world has seen. The f
lowing extract from a newspaper published at Tacoma in Was
ington (then a Territory) expresses with frank simplicity t
conception of greatness and happiness which is uppermo
in the Far West; and what may seem a touch of conscio
humour is, if humorous it be, none the less an expression
sincere conviction.

WHY WE SHOULD BE HAPPY

"Because we are practically at the head of navigation on Puget Sou
Tacoma is the place where all the surplus products of the south and of
east, that are exported by way of the Sound, must be laden on board
vessels that are to carry them to the four corners of the world. We sho
be happy because being at the head of navigation on Puget Sound, a
the shipping point for the south and east, the centre from which sh
radiate lines of commerce to every point on the circumference of the ea
we are also nearer by many miles than any other town on Puget Sou
to that pass in the Cascade mountains through which the Cascade divis
of the Northern Pacific railroad will be built in the near future; not o
nearer to the Stampede pass, but easily accessible from there by a railr
line of gentle grade, which is more than can be said of any town to
north of us.

"We should be happy for these reasons and because we are connec
by rail with Portland on the Willamette, with St. Paul, Chicago, and N
York; because being thus connected we are in daily communication w
the social, political, and financial centres of the western hemisphere;
cause all the people of the south and of the east who visit these sh
must first visit New Tacoma; because from here will be distributed to
people of the north-west all that shall be brought across the continent
the cars, and from here shall be distributed to merchants all over
United States the cargoes of ships returning here from every foreign
to load with wheat, coal, and lumber. We should be and we are ha
because New Tacoma is the Pacific coast terminus of a transcontine
line of railroad. Because this is the only place on the whole Pacific c

orth of San Francisco where through freight from New York can be loaded n ship directly from the cars in which it came from the Atlantic side.

"Other reasons why we should be happy are, that New Tacoma is in ie centre of a country where fruits and flowers, vegetables and grain, row in almost endless variety; that we are surrounded with everything eautiful in nature, that we have scenery suited to every mood, and that iere are opportunities here for the fullest development of talents of every ind. We have youth, good health, and opportunity. What more could e asked?"

If happiness is thus procurable, the Great West ought to be appy.[1] But there is often a malignant influence at work to estroy happiness in the shape of a neighbouring city, which making progress as swift or swifter, and threatens to eclipse s competitors. The rivalry between these Western towns is itense and extends to everything. It is sometimes dignified y an unselfish devotion to the greatness of the city which a an has seen grow with its own growth from infancy to a gorous manhood. I have known citizens of Chicago as proud Chicago as a Londoner, in the days of Elizabeth, was proud London. They show you the splendid parks and handsome renues with as much pleasure as a European noble shows his stle and his pictures: they think little of offering hundreds thousands of dollars to beautify the city or enrich it with library or an art gallery. In other men this laudable corate pride is stimulated, not only by the love of competition hich lies deep in the American as it does in the English east, but also by personal interest, for the prosperity of the dividual is inseparable from that of the town. As its fornes rise or fall, so will his corner lots or the profits of his ore. It is not all towns that succeed. Some after reaching certain point stand still, receiving few accessions; at other nes, after a year or two of bloom, a town wilts and withers; ade declines; enterprising citizens depart, leaving only the iftless and impecunious behind; the saloons are closed, the anties fall to ruin, in a few years nothing but heaps of straw d broken wood, with a few brick houses awaiting the next

[1] Tacoma has one glory which the inhabitants, it is to be feared, value less n those dwelt on in the article: it commands the finest view of a mountain the Pacific coast, perhaps in all North America, looking across its calm inlet he magnificent snowy mass of Mount Tacoma (14,700 feet) rising out of p dark forests thirty miles away.

blizzard to overthrow them, are left on the surface of t prairie. Thus Tacoma is harassed by the pretensions of t even more eager and enterprising Seattle; thus the great cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis have striven for the la twenty years for the title of Capital of the North-west. In 18 St. Paul was already a substantial city, and Minneapolis ju beginning to be known as the possessor of immense wat advantages from its position on the Mississippi at the Falls St. Anthony. Now, though St. Paul contains some 135,0 inhabitants, Minneapolis with 165,000 has distanced her the race, and has become, having in the process destroyed t beauty of her Falls, the greatest flour-milling centre in Am ica. The newspapers of each of such competing cities keep a constant war upon the other; and everything is done municipal bodies and individual citizens to make the wor believe that their city is advancing and all its neighbou standing still. Prosperity is largely a matter of advertisin for an afflux of settlers makes prosperity, and advertisin which can take many forms, attracts settlers. Many a pla has lived upon its "boom" until it found something more sol to live on; and to a stranger who asked in a small Far We tern town how such a city could keep up four newspapers, was well answered that it took four newspapers to keep such a city.

Confidence goes a long way towards success. And the con dence of these Westerns is superb. I happened in 1883 to at the city of Bismarck in Dakota when this young settleme was laying the corner-stone of its Capitol, intended to conta the halls of the legislature and other State offices of Dako when that flourishing Territory should have become a State, perhaps, for they spoke even then of dividing it, two State The town was then only some five years old, and may ha had six or seven thousand inhabitants. It was gaily decorat for the occasion, and had collected many distinguished gues —General U. S. Grant, several governors of neighbouri States and Territories, railroad potentates, and others. I far the most remarkable figure was that of Sitting Bull, t famous Sioux chief, who had surprised and slain a detachme of the American army some years before. Among the speech made, in one of which it was proved that as Bismarck was t

entre of Dakota, Dakota the centre of the United States, and ıe United States the centre of the world, Bismarck was estined to "be the metropolitan hearth of the world's civiliation," there came a short but pithy discourse from this grim ld warrior, in which he told us, through an interpreter, that ıe Great Spirit moved him to shake hands with everybody. lowever, the feature of the ceremonial which struck us Euroeans most was the spot chosen for the Capitol. It was not in ıe city, nor even on the skirts of the city; it was nearly a ile off, on the top of a hill in the brown and dusty prairie. Why here?" we asked. "Is it because you mean to enclose ıe building in a public park?" "By no means; the Capitol intended to be in the centre of the city; it is in this direcon that the city is to grow." It is the same everywhere om the Mississippi to the Pacific. Men seem to live in the ıture rather than in the present: not that they fail to work hile it is called to-day, but that they see the country not erely as it is, but as it will be, twenty, fifty, a hundred years ence, when the seedlings shall have grown to forest trees.

This constant reaching forward to and grasping at the future oes not so much express itself in words, for they are not a quacious people, as in the air of ceaseless haste and stress hich pervades the West.[1] They remind you of the crowd hich Vathek found in the hall of Eblis, each darting hither id thither with swift steps and unquiet mien, driven to and o by a fire in the heart. Time seems too short for what they ve to do, and result always to come short of their desire. ıe feels as if caught and whirled along in a foaming stream, afing against its banks, such is the passion of these men accomplish in their own life-times what in the past it ok centuries to effect. Sometimes in a moment of pause, for en the visitor finds himself infected by the all-pervading gerness, one is inclined to ask them: "Gentlemen, why in aven's name this haste? You have time enough. No enemy reatens you. No volcano will rise from beneath you. Ages d ages lie before you. Why sacrifice the present to the ture, fancying that you will be happier when your fields

[1] In the West men usually drop off the cars before they have stopped, and not enter them again till they are already in motion, hanging on like bees he end of the tail car as it quits the depot.

teem with wealth and your cities with people? In Europe w have cities wealthier and more populous than yours, and w are not happy. You dream of your posterity; but your pos terity will look back to yours as the golden age, and envy thos who first burst into this silent splendid nature, who first lifte up their axes upon these tall trees and lined these waters wit busy wharves. Why, then, seek to complete in a few decade what the other nations of the world took thousands of year over in the older continents? Why do things rudely and il which need to be done well, seeing that the welfare of you descendants may turn upon them? Why, in your hurry t subdue and utilize nature, squander her splendid gifts? Wh allow the noxious weeds of Eastern politics to take root i your new soil, when by a little effort you might keep it pure Why hasten the advent of that threatening day when the vacan spaces of the continent shall all have been filled, and th poverty or discontent of the older States shall find no outlet You have opportunities such as mankind has never had before and may never have again. Your work is great and noble: i is done for a future longer and vaster than our conceptions ca embrace. Why not make its outlines and beginnings worth of these destinies the thought of which gilds your hopes an elevates your purposes?"

Being once suddenly called upon to "offer a few remarks to a Western legislature, and having on the spur of the momen nothing better to offer, I tendered some such observations a these, seasoned, of course, with the compliments to the soi climate, and "location" reasonably expected from a visito They were received in good part, as indeed no people can b more kindly than the Western Americans; but it was surpri ing to hear several members who afterwards conversed wit me remark that the political point of view — the fact that the were the founders of new commonwealths, and responsible t posterity for the foundations they laid, a point of view so tri and obvious to a European visitor that he pauses before expres ing it — had not crossed their minds. If they spoke truly - as no doubt they did — there was in their words a furth evidence of the predominance of material efforts and interes over all others, even over those political instincts which a deemed so essential a part of the American character. T

rangements of his government lie in the dim background of e picture which fills the Western eye. In the foreground he es ploughs and sawmills, ore-crushers and railway locomo-ves. These so absorb his thoughts as to leave little time for nstitutions and legislation; and when constitutions and legis-tion are thought of, it is as means for better securing the nefits of the earth and of trade to the producer, and prevent-g the greedy corporation from intercepting their fruits.

Politically, and perhaps socially also, this haste and excite-ent, this absorption in the development of the material sources of the country, are unfortunate. As a town built in nurry is seldom well built, so a society will be the sounder in alth for not having grown too swiftly. Doubtless much of e scum will be cleared away from the surface when the liquid ttles and cools down. Lawlessness and lynch law will dis-pear; saloons and gambling-houses will not prosper in a ell-conducted population; schools will improve and universi-s grow out of the raw colleges which one already finds even the newer Territories. Nevertheless the bad habits of pro-ssional politics, as one sees them on the Atlantic coast, are t unknown in these communities; and the unrestfulness, the ssion for speculation, the feverish eagerness for quick and owy results, may so soak into the texture of the popular nd as to colour it for centuries to come. These are the adows which to the eye of the traveller seem to fall across e glowing landscape of the Great West.

CHAPTER CXVIII

THE FUTURE OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

THE task of forecasting the future is one from which a writer does well to turn away, for the coasts of history are strewn with the wrecks of predictions launched by historians and philosophers. No such ambitious task shall be essayed by me. But as I have described the institutions of the American commonwealth as they stand at this moment, seldom expressing an opinion as to their vitality or the influences which are at work to modify them, I may reasonably be asked to state, before bringing this book to a close, what processes of change these institutions seem to be at this moment undergoing. Changes move faster in our age than they ever moved before, and America is a land of change. No one doubts that fifty years hence it will differ at least as much from what it is now as it differs now from the America which Tocqueville described. The causes whose action will mould it are too numerous, too complex, to subtly interwoven to make it possible to conjecture their joint result. All we can ever say of the future is that it will be unlike the present. I will therefore attempt not to predict future changes, but only to indicate some of the processes of change now in progress which have gone far enough to let us see that they are due to causes of unmistakable potency, causes likely to continue in activity for some time to come.

I begin with a glance at the Federal system, whose equilibrium it has been the main object of the Federal Constitution to preserve. That equilibrium has been little disturbed. So far as law goes, it has suffered no change since the amendments to the Constitution which recorded and formulated the results of the Civil War. Before the war many Americans and most Europeans expected a dissolution of the Union

her by such a loosening of the Federal tie as would reduce e Union to a mere league, or by the formation of several ate groups wholly independent of one another. At this ment, however, nothing seems less likely than another ession. The States' Rights spirit has declined. The terial interests of every part of the country are bound up th those of every other. The capital of the Eastern cities s been invested in mines in the West, in ironworks and nufactories in the South, in mortgages and railroads every- ere. The South and the West need this capital for their velopment, and are daily in closer business relations with e East. The produce of the West finds its way to the lantic through the ports of the East. Every produce rket, every share market, vibrates in response to the Prod- e Exchange and Stock Exchange of New York. Each Part the country has come to know the other parts far better n was possible in earlier times; and the habit of taking rneys hither and thither grows with the always-growing ilities of travel. Many families have sons or brothers in ote States; many students come from the West and the th to Eastern universities, and form ties of close friend- p there. Railways and telegraphs are daily narrowing and pressing the vast area between ocean and ocean. As the ilized world was a larger world in the days of Herodotus n it is now, — for it took twice as many months to travel m the Caspian Sea to the Pillars of Hercules as it takes v to circumnavigate the globe; one was obliged to use a ater number of languages, and the journey was incompara- more dangerous, — so now the United States, with their ty-six millions of people, extending from the Bay of Fundy the Gulf of California, are a smaller country for all the poses of government, of commerce, and of social inter- rse, than they were before the cession of Louisiana in 1803, it took longer then to go from Boston to Charleston than akes now to go from Portland in Maine to Portland in gon, and the journey was far more costly and difficult.

Even the Pacific States, which might have seemed likely to n a community by themselves, are being drawn closer to se of the Mississippi basin. Population will in time be- e almost continuous along the lines of the Northern and

Southern Pacific Railways, and though the deserts of Nevad may remain unreclaimed, prosperous communities round th Great Salt Lake will form a link between California and th Rocky Mountain States. With more frequent communicatio local peculiarities and local habits of thought diminish; th South grows every day less distinctively Southern, and countr folk are more influenced by city ideas. There is now not single State with any material interest that would be benefite probably none with any sentiment that would be gratified, b separation from the body of the Union. No great questic has arisen tending to bind States into groups and stimulatir them to joint action. The chief problems which lie befo the country wear an aspect substantially the same in its var ous sections, and public opinion is divided on them in tho sections upon lines generally similar. In a word, the fa that the government is a Federal one does not at this mome seem to make any difference to the cohesion of the body politi the United States are no more likely to dissolve than if th were a unified republic like France or a unified monarchy li Italy.

As secession is improbable, so also is the extinction of t several States by absorption into the central government. was generally believed in Europe, when the North triumph over secession in 1865, that the Federal system was virtual at an end. The legal authority of Congress and the Preside had been immensely developed during the struggle; a powe ful army, flushed with victory, stood ready to enforce th authority; and there seemed reason to think that the Sout which had fought so stubbornly, would have to be kept dov during many years by military force. However, none of the apprehended results followed. The authority of the centr government presently sank back within its former limi some of the legislation based on the constitutional amendmer which had extended it for certain purposes being cut down judicial decision. The army was disbanded; self-governme was soon restored in the lately insurgent States, and t upshot of the years of civil war and reconstruction has bee while extinguishing the claim of State sovereignty, to repla the formerly admitted State rights upon a legal basis as fi as they ever occupied before. At this moment State rig

not in question, nor has either party an interest in advocat-
the supersession of State action in any department of gov-
ment. The conservatism of habit and well-settled legal
trine which would resist any such proposal is very strong.
te autonomy, as well as local government within each State,
prized by every class in the community, and bound up with
personal interest of those who feel that these comparatively
ited spheres offer a scope to their ambition which a wider
atre might deny.

It is nevertheless impossible to ignore the growing strength
he centripetal and unifying forces. I have already referred
he influence of easier and cheaper communications, of com-
rce and finance, of the telegraph, of the filling up of the
ermediate vacant spaces in the West. There is an increas-
tendency to invoke congressional legislation to deal with
tters, such as railroads, which cannot be adequately handled
State laws, or to remove divergencies, such as those in
krupt laws and the law of marriage and divorce, which
e rise to practical inconveniences. Those who advocate the
hibition of the sale of intoxicants are more and more apt
arry their action into the Federal sphere, while admitting
t the Federal Constitution would need amendment in order
nable Congress to effect what they desire. So the various
ties which profess to champion the interests of the farmers
f workingmen recur to the Federal government as the only
ncy strong enough and wide-reaching enough to give effect
heir proposals, most of which indeed would obviously be
racticable if tried in the narrow area of one or a few States.
te patriotism, State rivalry, State vanity, are no doubt
conspicuous, yet the political interest felt in State govern-
ts is slighter than it was forty years ago, while national
iotism has become warmer and more pervasive. The *rôle*
he State is socially and morally, if not legally, smaller
than it then was, and ambitious men look on a State leg-
ture as little more than a stepping-stone to Congress.
eover, the interference of the Federal Executive to sup-
s by military power disorders which State authorities have
ned unable or unwilling to deal with has recently shown
great a reserve of force lies in its hands, and has led
e-loving citizens to look to it as their ultimate resort in

troublous times. It would be rash to assert that disjuncti forces will never again reveal themselves, setting the Stat against the National government, and making States' Righ once more a matter of practical controversy. But any su force is likely, so far as we can now see, to prove transitor whereas the centripetal forces are permanent and secul forces, working from age to age. Wherever in the mode world there has been a centrifugal movement, tending to bre up a State united under one government, or to loosen the coh sion of its parts, the movement has sprung from a sentime of nationality, and has been reinforced, in almost every cas by a sense of some substantial grievance or by a belief th material advantages were to be secured by separation. T cases of Holland and Belgium, of Hungary and Germa Austria, of the Greeks and Bulgarians in their struggle wi the Turks, of Iceland in her struggle with Denmark, all illu trate this proposition. When such disjunctive forces a absent, the more normal tendency to aggregation and centra zation prevails. In the United States all the elements of national feeling are present, race,[1] language, literature, pri in past achievements, uniformity of political habits a ideas; and this national feeling which unifies the people reinforced by an immensely strong material interest in t maintenance of a single government over the breadth of t continent. It may therefore be concluded that while the is no present likelihood of change from a Federal to a conso dated republic, and while the existing legal rights and fu tions of the several States may remain undiminished for ma years to come, the importance of the States will decline as t majesty and authority of the National government increase.

The next question to be asked relates to the compone parts of the National government itself. Its equilibriu

[1] The immense influx of immigrants has not greatly affected the sense of r unity, for the immigrant's child is almost always eager to become to all inte and purposes an American. Moreover, the immigrants are so dispersed o the country that no single section of them is in any State nearly equal to native population. However, here and there in the West, Germans have t to appropriate townships or villages, and keep English-speaking folk at a tance; and in Wisconsin their demand to have German taught regularly in schools lately gave rise to some bitterness. But the very fact that the feel of racial distinction produces no results more serious than these shows h far that feeling is from being a source of political danger.

ands now as stable as at any former epoch. Yet it has twice xperienced violent oscillations. In the days of Jackson, and gain in those of Lincoln, the Executive seemed to outweigh ongress. In the days of Tyler, Congress threatened the xecutive, while in those of Andrew Johnson it reduced the xecutive to impotence. That no permanent disturbance of e balance followed the latter of these oscillations shows how ell the balance had been adjusted at starting. At this mo-ent there is nothing to show that any one department is ining on any other. The Judiciary, if indeed the judges n be called a political department, would seem to have less scretionary power than seventy years ago, for by their own cisions they have narrowed the scope of their discretion, termining points in which, had they remained open, the rsonal impulses and views of the Bench might have had om to play. Congress has been the branch of government ith the largest facilities for usurping the powers of the her branches, and probably with the most disposition to do . Congress has constantly tried to encroach both on the xecutive and on the States, sometimes, like a wild bull driven to a corral, dashing itself against the imprisoning walls of e Constitution. But although Congress has succeeded in cupying nearly all of the area which the Constitution left cant and unallotted between the several authorities it estab-hed, Congress has not become any more distinctly than in rlier days the dominant power in the State, the organ of tional sovereignty, the irresistible exponent of the national ll. In a country ruled by public opinion, it could hold this sition only in virtue of its capacity for leading opinion, that to say, of its courage, promptitude, and wisdom. Since it ows in no one of these qualities, it wins no greater ascen-ncy; indeed its power, as compared with that of public inion, seems rather to decline. Its division into two co-linate Houses is no doubt a source of weakness as well as safety. Yet what is true of Congress as a whole is true of ch House taken separately. The Senate, to which the emi-nce of many individual senators formerly gave a moral endency, has lost as much in the intellectual authority of members as it has gained in their wealth. The House, with far greater numbers and its far greater proportion of inex-

perienced members, suffers from the want of internal orga
zation, and seems unable to keep pace with the increasi
demands made on it for constructive legislation. Now a
then the helplessness of the House when a party major
happens to be torn by internal dissensions, or the selfishn
of the Senate when in its almost equally divided body t
interests or animosities of individual senators have full ro
to play, causes delays and leads to compromises or half me
ures which exasperate even this all too patient people. C
is sometimes inclined to think that Congress might lose
hold on the esteem and confidence of the nation, and sink i
a subordinate position, were there any other authority wh
could be substituted for it. There is, however, no su
authority, for law-making cannot be given to a person or
a court, while the State legislatures have the same faults
Congress in a greater degree. We may accordingly surm
that Congress will retain its present place; but so far as
be gathered from present phenomena, it will retain this pl
in respect not of the satisfaction of the people with its s
vices, but of their inability to provide a better servant.

The weakness of Congress is the strength of the Preside
Though it cannot be said that his office has risen in power
dignity since 1789, there are reasons for believing that it n
reach a higher point than it has occupied at any time si
the Civil War. The tendency everywhere in America to c
centrate power and responsibility in one man is unmistakab
There is no danger that the President should become a desp
that is, should attempt to make his will prevail against
will of the majority. But he may have a great part to p
as the leader of the majority and the exponent of its will.
is in some respects better fitted both to represent and to in
ence public opinion than Congress is. No doubt he suff
from being the nominee of a party, because this draws
every act he does the hostility of zealots of the opposite pa
But the number of voters who are not party zealots increas
increases from bad causes as well as from good causes; fo
a capable President sways the dispassionately patriotic, s
crafty President can find means of playing upon those v
have their own ends to serve. A vigorous personality attra
the multitude, and attracts it the more the huger it gr

nd the more the characteristic weaknesses of Congress stand evealed; while a chief magistrate's influence, though his olitical opponents may complain of it, excites little alarm hen exerted in leading a majority which acts through the onstitutional organs of government. There may therefore be ill undeveloped possibilities of greatness in store for the residents of the future. But as these possibilities depend, ke the possibilities of the British and German Crowns, perhaps one may add of the Papacy, on the wholly unpredictable lement of personal capacity in the men who may fill the office, e need speculate on them no further.

From the organs of government I pass to the party system, s machinery and its methods. Nothing in recent history sugests that the statesmen who claim to be party leaders, or the olitically who act as party managers, are disposed either to oosen the grip with which their organization has clasped the ountry, or to improve the methods it employs. Changes in arty measures there will of course be in the future, as there ave been in the past; but the professionals are not the men make them changes for the better. The Machine will not e reformed from within: it must be assailed from without. wo heavy blows have been lately struck at it. The first was ie Civil Service Reform Act of 1883. If this Act is honestly dministered, and its principle extended to other Federal ofces, if States and cities follow, as a few have done, in the ake of the National government, the Spoils System may efore long be rooted out, and with that system the power of ie Machine will crumble. The Spoils System has stood for me sixty years, and the bad habits it has formed cannot at ace be unlearned. But its extinction will deprive professionals their chief present motive for following politics. The tares hich now infest the wheat will presently wither away, and e old enemy will have to sow a fresh crop of some other nd. The second blow has been the passing, in all the States t seven, of secret ballot laws, which have reduced the power Machines and tended to make elections purer. And the ird is the frequent appearance, not merely in Federal elecons, but in State and municipal elections, of a body of indendent men pledged to vote for honest candidates irrespective party. The absence for a number of years past of genuine

political issues dividing the two parties, which has worked in taking moral and intellectual life out of the parties, a making their contests mere scrambles for office, has at l worked well in disposing intelligent citizens to sit more loo to party ties, and to consider, since it is really on men rath than on measures that they are required to vote, what t personal merits of candidates are. Forty years ago, just the time when the fruits of Jacksonism, that is to say, of w democratic theory coupled with sordid and quite undemocra practice, had begun to be felt by thoughtful persons, t urgency of the slavery question compelled the postponement reforms in political methods, and made patriotic men fli themselves into party warfare with unquestioning zeal. Wh the winning of elections, no less than the winning of battl meant the salvation of the Union, no one could stop to exam the machinery of party. For ten years after the war, the pa which was usually in the majority in the North was the pa which had saved the Union, and on that score commanded devotion of its old adherents; while the opposite party was much absorbed in struggling back to power that it did think of mending its ways. During the last fifteen or twe years, the war issues being practically settled, public-spiri citizens have addressed themselves to the task, which ought have been undertaken in 1850, of purifying politics. Th efforts began with city government, where the evils w greatest, but have now become scarcely less assiduous in St and national politics.

Will these efforts continue, and be crowned by a grow measure of success?

To a stranger revisiting America at intervals, the progr seems to be steadily though very slowly upward. This is a the belief of those Americans who, having most exerted th selves in the struggle against Bosses and spoilsmen, have most misrepresentation to overcome and most disappointme to endure. The Presidents of this generation are abler r than those of forty years ago, and less apt to be the n creatures of a knot of party managers. The poisonous in ence of slavery is no longer felt. There is every day les sentimentalism, but not less of earnestness in political cussions. There is less blind obedience to party, less disp

on to palliate sins committed from party motives. The umber of able men who occupy themselves with scientific conomics and politics is larger, their books and articles are ore widely read. The press more frequently helps in the ork of reform: the pulpit deals more largely with questions f practical philanthropy and public morals. That it should e taken as a good sign when the young men of a city throw emselves into politics, shows that the new generation is elieved to have either a higher sense of public duty or a less avish attachment to party ties than that whose votes have revailed for the last twenty years. Above all, the nation is ss self-sufficient and self-satisfied than it was in days when it ad less to be proud of. Fifty years ago the Americans walked a vain conceit of their own greatness and freedom and orned instruction from the effete monarchies of the Old Vorld, which repaid them with contemptuous indifference. o despot ever exacted more flattery from his courtiers than ey from their statesmen. Now when Europe admires their ower, envies their wealth, looks to them for instruction in not few subjects, they have become more modest, and listen llingly to speakers and writers who descant upon their fail-gs. They feel themselves strong enough to acknowledge eir weaknesses, and are anxious that the moral life of the tion should be worthy of its expanding fortunes. As these ppy omens have become more visible from year to year, there a reasonable presumption that they represent a steady cur-nt which will continue to work for good. To judge of nerica rightly the observer must not fix his eye simply upon r present condition, seeking to strike a balance between the il and the good that now appear. He must look back at hat the best citizens and the most judicious strangers per-ved and recorded fifty, thirty, twenty years ago, and ask ether the shadows these men saw were not darker than those to-day, whether the forecasts of evil they were forced to m have not in many cases been belied by the event. Tocque-le was a sympathetic as well as penetrating observer. Many the evils he saw, and which he thought inherent and incur-e, have now all but vanished. Other evils have indeed realed themselves which he did not discern, but these may ve as transient as those with which he affrighted European

readers in 1834. The men I have met in America, who recollections went back to the fourth decade of this centur agreed in saying that there was in those days a more viole and unscrupulous party spirit, a smaller respect for law, greater disposition to violence, less respect for the opinion the wise, a completer submission to the prejudices of t masses, than there is to-day. Neither the Irish nor the G mans had arrived upon the scene, but New York was alrea given over to spoilsmen. Great corporations had scarce arisen; yet corruption was neither uncommon nor fatal to politician's reputation. A retrospect which shows us th some evils have declined or vanished while the regenerati forces are more numerous and more active in combating n mischiefs than they ever were before, encourages the bel that the general stream of tendency is towards improveme and will in time bring the public life of the country nearer the ideal which democracy is bound to set before itself.

When the Americans say, as they often do, that they tr to time, they mean that they trust to reason, to the genera sound moral tone of the multitude, to a shrewdness which af failures and through experiments learns what is the true int est of the majority, and finds that this interest coincides w the teachings of morality. They can afford to wait, becau they have three great advantages over Europe, an absence class distinctions and class hatred, a diffusion of wealth amo an immense number of small proprietors all interested in t defence of property, an exemption from chronic pauperism a economical distress, work being at most times abundant, ma careers open, the still unoccupied or undeveloped West p viding a safety valve available in times of depression. W these advantages the Americans conceive that were their co try now left entirely to itself, so that full and free scope co be secured to the ameliorative forces, political progress wo be sure and steady; the best elements would come to the t and when the dregs had settled the liquor would run clear.

In a previous chapter I have observed that this sangu view of the situation omits two considerations. One is t the country will not be left to itself. European immigrat continues, and though more than two-thirds of the immigra make valuable citizens, the remainder, many by their politi

gnorance and instability, some few by their proneness to mbrace anti-social doctrines, are a source of danger to the ommunity, lowering its tone, providing material for dema- ogues to work on, threatening outbreaks like those of Penn- lvania in 1877, of Cincinnati in 1884, of Chicago in 1886, of rge districts in the West in 1893 and 1894.

The other fact to be borne in mind is of still graver import. here is a part of the Atlantic where the westward speeding eam-vessel always expects to encounter fogs. On the fourth fifth day of the voyage, while still in bright sunlight, one es at a distance a long low dark-gray line across the bows, nd is told this is the first of the fog-banks which have to be aversed. Presently the vessel is upon the cloud, and rushes to its chilling embrace, not knowing what perils of icebergs ay be shrouded within the encompassing gloom. So Amer- a, in her swift onward progress, sees, looming on the horizon nd now no longer distant, a time of mists and shadows, herein dangers may lie concealed whose form and magnitude e can scarcely yet conjecture. As she fills up her western gions with inhabitants, she sees the time approach when all e best land will have been occupied, and when the land now nder cultivation will have been so far exhausted as to yield antier crops even to more expensive culture. Although ansportation may also have then become cheaper, the price food will rise; farms will be less easily obtained and will ed more capital to work them with profit; the struggle for istence will become more severe. And while the outlet nich the West now provides for the overflow of the great ties will have become less available, the cities will have own immensely more populous; pauperism, now confined to me six or seven of the greatest, will be more widely spread; ages will probably sink and work be less abundant. In fact e chronic evils and problems of old societies and crowded untries, such as we see them to-day in Europe, will have appeared on this new soil.

High economic authorities pronounce that the beginnings of is time of pressure lie not more than thirty years ahead. early all of the best arable land in the West is already occu- ed, so that the second and third best will soon begin to be ltivated; while the exhaustion already complained of in

farms which have been under the plough for three or fo
decades will be increasingly felt. It will be a time of trial f
democratic institutions. The future of the United States du
ing the next half century sometimes presents itself to t
mind as a struggle between two forces, the one beneficent, t
other malign, the one striving to speed the nation on to a po
of safety before this time of trial arrives, the other to reta
its progress, so that the tempest may be upon it before t
port is reached. And the question to which one reverts
musing on the phenomena of American politics is this — Wi
the progress now discernible towards a wiser public opini
and a higher standard of public life succeed in bringing t
mass of the people up to the level of what are now the be
districts in the country before the days of pressure are at han
Or will existing evils prove so obstinate, and European imm
gration so continue to depress the average of intelligence a
patriotism among the voters, that when the struggle for li
grows far harder than it now is, the masses will yield to t
temptation to abuse their power and will seek violent, a
because violent, probably vain and useless remedies, for t
evils which will afflict them? Some such are indeed now pr
posed, and receive a support which, small as it is, is larg
than any one would thirty years ago have predicted for the

If the crisis should arrive while a large part of the popul
tion still lacks the prudence and self-control which a democra
ought to possess, what result may be looked for? This is
question which no experience from similar crises in the pa
helps us to answer, for the phenomena will be new in the h
tory of the world. There may be pernicious experiments tri
in legislation. There may be — indeed there have been alrea
— occasional outbreaks of violence. There may even
though nothing at present portends it, a dislocation of t
present frame of government. One thing, however, need n
be apprehended, the thing with which alarmists most f
quently terrify us: there will not be anarchy. The forc
which restore order and maintain it when restored are
strong in America as anywhere else in the world.

While admitting the possibility of such a time of strife a
danger, he who has studied America will not fail to note t
she will have elements of strength for meeting it which

cking in some European countries. The struggles of labour
ıd capital, though they have of late years become more viru-
nt, do not seem likely to take the form of a widely prevailing
ıtred between classes. The distribution of landed property
ıong a great many small owners is likely to continue. The
ıbits of freedom, together with the moderation and self-
ntrol which they foster, are likely to stand unimpaired, or
be even confirmed and mellowed by longer use. The
straining and conciliating influence of religion is stronger
an in France or Germany, and more enlightened than in
ose continental countries where religion now seems strongest.
admit that no one can say how far the United States of fifty
ars hence will in these respects resemble the United States
to-day. But if we are to base our anticipations on the facts
to-day, we may look forward to the future, not indeed with-
t anxiety, when we mark the clouds that hang on the horizon,
t with a hope that is stronger than anxiety.

CHAPTER CXIX

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FUTURE

If it be hard to forecast the development of political insti tutions and habits, how much harder to form a conception o what the economic and social life of the United States wil have become when another half-century of marvellously swif material progress has more than quintupled its wealth an more than tripled its population; and when the number o persons pursuing arts and letters, and educated to enjoy th most refined pleasures of life, will have become proportionatel greater than it is now. The changes of the last fifty years great as they have been, may then prove to have been n greater than those which the next fifty will have brough Prediction is even more difficult in this sphere than in th sphere of government, because the forces at work to modif society are more numerous, as well as far more subtle an complex, and because not only the commercial prosperity o the country, but its thought and culture are more likely tha its politics to be affected by the course of events in the Ol World. All I can attempt is, as in the last preceding chapte to call attention to some of the changes which are now i progress, and to conjecture whether the phenomena we no observe are due to permanent or to transitory causes. I sha speak first of economic changes and their influence on certai current problems, next of the movements of population an possible alterations in its character, lastly, of the tendencie which seem likely to continue to affect the social and inte lectual life of the nation.

The most remarkable economic feature of the years tha have elapsed since the war has been the growth of grea fortunes. There is a passage in the *Federalist*, written i 1788, which says, "the private fortunes of the President an

enators, as they must all be American citizens, cannot possi-ly be sources of danger." Even in 1833, Tocqueville was truck by the equal distribution of wealth in the United States nd the absence of capitalists. To-day, however, there are nore great millionaires, as well as more men with a capital of rom $250,000 to $1,000,000 (£50,000 to £200,000), in Amer-ca than in any other country; and forty years hence it may robably contain as many large fortunes as will exist in all he countries of Europe put together. Nor are these huge ccumulations due to custom and the policy of the law, which ave in England kept property, and especially landed property, n the hands of a few by the so-called custom of primogeniture, hereas in the American States the influence of law has tended ne other way. An American testator usually distributes his ealth among his children equally. However rich he may be, he oes not expect his daughters to marry rich men, but is just as illing to see them mated to persons supporting themselves by neir own efforts. And he is far more inclined than Europeans re to bestow large part of his wealth upon objects of public tility, instead of using it to found a family. In spite of these spersing forces, great fortunes grow with the growing wealth f the country, and the opportunities it offers of amassing normous piles by bold operations. Even an unspeculative usiness may, if skilfully conducted, bring in greater gains han can often be hoped for in Europe, because the scale of perations is in America so large that a comparatively small ercentage of profit may mean a very large income. These auses are likely to be permanent; nor can any legislation hat is compatible with the rights of property as now under-ood, do much to restrict them. We may therefore expect hat the class of very rich men, men so rich as to find it diffi-lt to spend their income in enjoying life, though they may on employing it in business, will continue to increase.

It may be suggested that the great fortunes of to-day are ue to the swift development of the West, so that after a time ey will cease to arise in such numbers, while those we now e will have been scattered. The development of the West ust, however, continue for forty or fifty years to come; and ough the wealthy do not seek to keep their wealth together ter their death by artificial means, many are the sons of the

rich who start with capital enough to give them a great advan tage for further accumulation. There are as yet comparatively few careers to compete with business; nor is it as easy as in Europe to spend a fortune on pleasure. The idle rich o America, who, though relatively few, are numerous enough t form a class in the greatest Atlantic cities, seem by no means the most contented class in the country.

The growth of vast fortunes has helped to create a politica problem, for they become a mark for the invective of the more extreme sections of the Labour or Socialist parties. But should their propaganda so far prosper as to produce legislative attacks upon accumulated wealth, such attacks will be directed (a least in the first instance), not against individual rich men but against incorporated companies, since it is through corpo rations that wealth has made itself obnoxious. Why th power of these bodies should have grown so much greater i the United States than in Europe, and why they should b more often controlled by a small knot of men, are question too intricate to be here discussed. Companies are in many ways so useful that any general diminution of the legal facili ties for forming them seems improbable; but I conceive tha they will be even more generally than hitherto subjected t special taxation; and that their power of taking and usin public franchises will be further restricted. He who consider the irresponsible nature of the power which three or fou men, or perhaps one man, can exercise through a great corpo ration, such as a railroad or telegraph company, the injur they can inflict on the public as well as on their competitors the cynical audacity with which they have often used thei wealth to seduce officials and legislators from the path o virtue, will find nothing unreasonable in the desire of th American masses to regulate the management of corporation and narrow the range of their action. The same remar applies, with even more force, to combinations of men no incorporated but acting together, the so-called Trusts, *i.e.* com mercial rings, or syndicates. The next few years or eve decades may be largely occupied with the effort to deal wit these phenomena of a commercial system far more highl developed than the world has yet seen elsewhere. The ec nomic advantages of the amalgamation of railroads and th

ndency in all departments of trade for large concerns to sorb or supplant small ones, are both so marked that prob-ms of this order seem likely to grow even larger and more rgent than they now are. Their solution will demand, not ly great legal skill, but great economic wisdom.

Of the tendency to aggregation there are happily few signs so r as relates to agriculture. The only great landed estates e in the Far West, particularly in California, where they are relic from Spanish days, together with some properties held land companies or individual speculators in the Upper ississippi States, properties which are being generally sold small farms to incoming settlers. The census returns of 90 do no doubt show a slight increase in the number of per-ns who hire from others the lands they till. While the crease in the number of farms cultivated by the owner uring the decade ending with that year was only 9.56 per nt, that of farms rented for money by the cultivator was .04 per cent, and that of farms rented for a share of the oducts 19.65 per cent. This may, however, be due partly the growth of small negro farms in the South, partly to the sposition of many Western farmers to retire from active bour when old age approaches, letting their farms, and living the rent thereof, partly also to the buying up of lands near "boom town" by speculators for a rise. Taking the country a whole, there is no indication of any serious change to rge properties.[1] In the South, large plantations are more re than before the war, and much of the cotton crop is raised peasant farmers, as the increase in the number of farms turned in 1890 proves. It is of course possible that cultiva-on on a large scale may in some regions turn out to be ore profitable than that of small freeholders: agriculture an art may be still in its infancy, and science may alter e conditions of production in this highly inventive country. ut at present nothing seems to threaten that system of small oprietors tilling the soil they live on which so greatly con-

[1] Of the 4,564,641 farms returned in the census of 1890, 3,269,728 are culti-ed by the owner and 1,294,913 rented by the farmer; and of those owned le more than one-fourth would appear to be subject to mortgages. The portion to the whole number of dwellings not owned but hired by those o live in them is, of course, very much larger, viz. 63 per cent for the whole untry, and 76 per cent for the cities with more than 50,000 inhabitants.

tributes to the happiness and stability of the commonwealt
The motives which in Europe induce rich men to buy lar
estates are here wholly wanting, for no one gains either poli
cal power or social status by becoming a landlord.

Changes in economic conditions have begun to bring abo
changes in population which will work powerfully on t
future of society and politics. One such change has be
passing on New England during the last twenty years. I
comparatively thin and ungenial soil, which has generally ha
rock at no great depth below the surface, and has been cul
vated in many places for nigh two hundred years, is now unab
to sustain the competition of the rich and virgin lands of t
West. The old race of New England yeomen have according
begun to sell or abandon their farms and to migrate to t
upper valley of the Mississippi, where they make the pr
perity of the North-western States. The lands which th
have left vacant are frequently occupied by immigrants, son
times French Canadians, but chiefly Irish, for few Germa
and Slavs come to New England; and thus that which was t
most purely English part of America is now becoming one
the most Celtic, since the cities also are full of Irish and Ca
dians. In Massachusetts, for instance, the persons of forei
birth or parentage are already 56 per cent of the populatio
in Rhode Island 58 per cent. It is impossible not to regret t
disappearance of a picturesquely primitive society which n
elists and essayists have made familiar to us, with its delig
ful mixture of homely simplicity and keen intelligence.
all the types of rustic life which imagination has since t
days of Theocritus embellished for the envy or refreshme
of the dwellers in cities, this latest type has been to mode
Europe the most real and not the least attractive. It w
soon have passed away; nor will the life of the robust sons
the Puritans in the North-western prairies, vast and bare a
new, reproduce the idyllic quality of their old surroundin
But the Irish squatters on the forsaken farms rear th
children under better conditions than those either of t
American cities or of the island of their birth, and they a
replenishing New England with a vigorous stock.

Another change may possibly be seen when in the course
a few decades immigration begins to turn towards a South

gion, the far greater part of which has remained until now ndeveloped. Western North Carolina, Northern Georgia nd Alabama, and Eastern Tennessee possess enormous min-al deposits, only a few of which have yet begun to be worked. here are splendid forests; there is in many places a soil elieved to be fertile, little of which has been brought under ltivation; while the climate is in general not too hot for hite labour. It seems probable that when the vacant spaces the North-west are no longer wide enough to receive the ntinued influx of settlers, these regions will become the at of industries attracting and employing a vast population: nd this population may in large measure come from the more rowded parts of the Northern States, carrying with it North-rn habits and ideas which will quicken the progress of a ackward part of the South, and bring her into a more perfect rmony with the rest of the country.

The mention of the South raises a group of questions, bear-g on the future of the negro and the relations he will sustain the whites, which need not be discussed here, as they have en dealt with in preceding chapters (Chapters XCII. and CIII.). The alarm which the growth of the coloured people rmerly excited was allayed by the census of 1890, which owed that they increase more slowly than the whites, even in e South, and form a constantly diminishing proportion of e total population of the country. The negro is doubtless a avy burden for American civilization to carry. No problems em likely so long to confront the nation, and so severely to x the national character on its moral side, as those which his esence raises. Much patience will be needed, and much mpathy. The negro, however, is necessary to the South, for ly he can till its hot and unhealthy lowlands; and his labour s proved helpful also to the mine-owners and iron-masters the mining regions I have just referred to. His progress ce emancipation has been more rapid than those who saw n in slavery expected, and gives ground for hope. So far m relapsing into sloth and barbarism, like his kinsfolk in st of the Antilles (where a few weeks' labour may provide d enough to support a family through the year), the negro s, especially in those districts where he is most in industrial ntact with the whites, risen steadily in education, in intelli-

gence, in thrift, and in habits of steady industry. Other con tact than industrial there is none, except so far as philanthro pists seek him out to help him, for from social intercourse, an above all from intermarriage, with the whites, he is rigidl debarred. Painful as are the incidents of this social separatio and still more deplorable as are the occasional outbreaks o lawless violence against negroes accused of crimes agains women, the relation of the two races is not, on the whole, on of mutual aversion, and does not contain any present element of political danger. Even if the negro remains practicall excluded in some States from the exercise of the suffrage, h condition is not the same as though he had never received tha gift, for the fact that he is legally a citizen has raised both th white's view of him and his own view of himself. Thoughtf observers in the South seem to feel little anxiety, and expe that for many years to come the negroes, naturally a goo natured and easy-going race, will be content with the positio of an inferior caste, which does the humbler kinds of wo and unfortunately contributes a large quota of petty crim but which will nevertheless become gradually permeated b American habits and ideas, and will send up into the high walks of life a slowly increasing number of its ablest membe It might be thought that this elevating process would be acc erated by the sympathy of the coloured people at the Nort who, as they enjoy greater educational opportunities, mig be expected to advance more quickly. But the negro ra increases comparatively slowly to the north of latitude 4 and even there it neither blends with the whites nor mak sufficient progress in wealth and influence to be able to he its Southern members. A very high authority estimates t probable coloured population in 1900 at ten millions out a total population of eighty millions, and adds the rema that, "considering the limited area of land in which negro have an advantage over whites by physiological adaptation climate, and the industrial advantage of the whites whe climatic conditions are equal, it is doubtful whether the is room in the South for so large a population."[1]

[1] General Francis A. Walker in *Ency. Brit.*, article "United States." 1790 the coloured people were 19.3 per cent of the total population of United States, and in 1880 only 13.1. In 1890 the percentage had sunk to 1

Two other questions relating to changes in population must e adverted to before we leave this part of the subject. There e Europeans who hold — and in this physiologically-minded ge it is natural that men should hold — that the evolution of distinctively American type of character and manners must still distant, because the heterogeneous elements of the pulation (in which the proportion of English blood is naller now than it was fifty years ago) must take a long ne to become mixed and assimilated. This is a plausible ew; yet I doubt whether differences of blood have the im- rtance which it assumes. What strikes the traveller, and hat the Americans themselves delight to point out to him, the amazing solvent power which American institutions, bits, and ideas exercise upon newcomers of all races. The ildren of Irishmen, Germans, and Scandinavians are certainly r more like native Americans than the current views of redity would have led us to expect; nor is it without inter- t to observe that Nature has here repeated on the Western ntinent that process of mixing Celtic with Germanic and rse blood which she began in Britain more than a thou- nd years ago. The ratio borne by the Celtic elements in e population of Great Britain (*i.e.* the Picts and Gaels of rthern Britain and those of the Cymry of Middle and West- n Britain who survived the onslaught of the Angles and xons in the fifth and sixth centuries) to the Teutonic ow German and Norse) elements in that population as it od in the seventeenth century, when England began to onize North America, may probably be a ratio not much aller than that which the Irish immigrants to America bear the German immigrants: so that the relative proportions Celtic and Teutonic blood, as these proportions may be en to have existed in the Americans of a hundred years , have not been greatly altered by the Irish and the Ger- n immigration of the last six decades.[1]

This parallel may seem fanciful, yet those who lay stress on

[1] The analogy may be carried one step farther by observing that the Scan- avians who now settle in the North-western States, as they have come to erica later than Celts or Germans, so also have come in a proportion to s and Germans corresponding to that borne to the previous inhabitants of ain by the Danes and Norwegians who poured their vigorous blood into veins of the English race from the ninth century onwards.

race characteristics and expect the American people of th
future to be sensibly changed by immigration, may be aske
to remember that in that immigration neither the Celtic n
the Teutonic element has so far been able to preponderate.
venture, however, to believe that the intellectual and moral a
mosphere into which the settlers from Europe come has mo
power to assimilate them than their race qualities have pow
to change it; and that the future of America will be le
affected by this influx of new blood than any one who has n
studied the American democracy of to-day can realize. Th
time has not yet arrived for the formation of definite concl
sions on this most interesting problem; so I will venture
say no more than this, that the influence of European immigr
tion is so far to be sought, not so much in any tinging of th
national character, as economically in the amazingly swi
growth of the agricultural West, and politically in the u
fortunate results it has had upon the public life of citie
in the outbreaks of savage violence which may be traced to
particularly in the mining districts, and in the unexpected
severe strain it has put on universal suffrage. Nor mu
another source of evil pass unnoticed. The most conspicuo
evidence of American prosperity has been hitherto seen in th
high standard of living to which the native working classes
the North have risen, in the abundance of their food and th
quality of their clothing, in the neatness and comfort of the
homes, in the decent orderliness of their lives, and the for
ness for reading of their women. The settlers of the last ha
century, though at first far behind the native Americans in
these respects, have tended to rise to their level and, except
a few of the larger cities, have after fifteen or twenty yea
practically adopted American standards of comfort. But with
the last decade new swarms of European immigrants have
vaded America, drawn from their homes in the eastern parts
Central Europe by the constant cheapening of ocean tran
and by that more thorough drainage, so to speak, of the inla
regions of Europe which is due to the extension of railway

[1] The largest percentages of increase of foreign population were in
decade 1880-90, the following. Persons born in Hungary 441 per cent, in Rus
411 per cent, in Italy 312 per cent, in Austria 218 per cent, in Poland
per cent.

These immigrants, largely of Slavonic race, come from a lower stratum of civilization than the German immigrants of the past, and, since they speak foreign tongues, are less quickly amenable to American influences, and probably altogether less improvable, than are the Irish. There seems to be a danger that if they continue to come in large numbers they may retain their own low standard of decency and comfort, and menace the continuance among the working class generally of that far higher standard which has hitherto prevailed in all but a few spots in the country. Already the United States, which twenty years ago rejoiced in the increase of immigration, has begun to regard it with disquiet; and laws are passed to prevent the entrance not only of labourers brought under contract but of criminals and of persons who seem likely to become a burden upon the community.[1]

The intrusion of these inauspicious elements is not the only change in the population which may cause anxiety. For many years past there has been an indraught of people from the rural districts to the cities. Thirty per cent of the whole sixty-six millions are now, it is estimated, to be found in cities with a population exceeding 8000, and the transfer of people from a rural to an urban life goes on all the faster because it is due not merely to economic causes, such as operate all the world over, and to the spirit of enterprise which is strong in the American youth, but also to the distaste which the average native American, a more sociable and amusement-loving being than the English or German peasant, feels for the isolation of farm life and the monotony of farm labour.[2] Even in 1844 R. W. Emerson wrote: "The cities drain the country of the best part of its population, the flower of the youth of both sexes

[1] Such laws are of course difficult of enforcement, because when the immigrants arrive it is seldom possible to say which ought to be refused ingress as paupers or criminals; and it has accordingly been proposed to throw upon United States Consuls at European ports of departure the duty of sifting those who seek to embark for America, and granting certificates to those who are approved. However, in the year ending June 30th, 1892, 2801 were debarred from entering, the total immigration for 1892 being 547,060.

[2] There is sometimes a scarcity of labour on farms in the Eastern States, while the cities are crowded with men out of work.

The percentage of urbans to total population, which in 1790 was 3.35 was in 1890 29.12. In the North Atlantic States it was 51.58 per cent of the population of those States. The increase is chiefly in a few large cities.

goes into the towns, and the country is cultivated by a muc
inferior class." Since then the Western forests have bee
felled and the Western prairies brought under the plough b
the stalwart sons of New England and New York. But no
again, and in the West hardly less than in the East, the co
plaint goes up that native American men and women long f
a city life, and gladly leave tillage to the newcomers from Ge
many and Scandinavia. Whether a city-bred population w
have the physical vigour which the native rural population h
shown — a population which in some of the Western Stat
strikes one as perhaps more vigorous than any Europe ca
point to — is at least doubtful, for though American citi
have sanitary advantages greater than those of most towns
Europe, the stress and strain of their city life is more exhaus
ing. And it need scarcely be added that in the oldest ar
most highly civilized districts of the country, and among th
more refined sections of the people, the natural increase
population is much smaller than it is among the poorer ar
the ruder.

We have been wont to think of the principle of natur
selection as that which makes for the progress of the race
the human, as it has done in the other families of animat
creatures. But in the most advanced communities this pri
ciple is apt to be reversed, and the section of the populati
which tends to propagate itself most largely is that ve
section which is least fitted to raise, or even to sustain, t
intellectual and moral level, as well as the level of physic
excellence, already attained. Marriages are later and far
lies smaller among the best nurtured and most cultivat
class than they are among the uneducated and improvider
more children are born to the physically weak and moral
untrained than to those among the rich whose natural gi
would in ages of violence, when men and families surviv
by physical and mental strength, have enabled them to prev
in the struggle for existence. Thus a force which once work
powerfully for the improvement of a national stock has n
been turned the other way, and makes for a decline in t
average capacities wherewith each man is born into the wor
So in New England and the Eastern States generally, thou
there are families, historic by the number of eminent nam

hey have produced, which still flourish and count their cousin-ood by hundreds, it is nevertheless true that the original nglish race, if it grows at all, grows less swiftly than the rish or the German, and far less swiftly than it did some xty years ago.[1] Yet here also that assimilative power of hich I have spoken comes to the help of the nation. Those ho rise from the less cultivated class, who do not belong to hat Dr. Holmes calls the Brahmin caste, still surviving in ew England and once strong in Virginia, are breathed upon y the spirit of the country; they absorb its culture and carry n its traditions; and they do so all the more readily because ne pervading sense of equality makes a man's entrance into a ass higher than that wherein he was born depend solely on is personal qualities.

European readers may ask whether the swift growth not nly of wealth but of great fortunes in the United States will ot end in creating an aristocracy of rich families, and there-ith a new structure of society. I see no ground for expecting is, not merely because the wealthiest class passes down by nperceptible gradations of fortune to a working class far bet-r off than the working classes of Europe, but also because ne faith in equality and the love of equality are too deeply nplanted in every American breast to be rooted out by any conomic changes. They are the strongest beliefs and passions f the people. They make no small part of the people's daily appiness; and I can more easily imagine the United States rned into a monarchy on the one hand or a group of petty publics on the other than the aristocratic ideas and habits of ermany or even of England established on American soil. ocial exclusiveness there may be, — signs of it are already scernible, — but visible and overt recognitions of differences rank, whether in the use of hereditary titles, or in the ossession by one class of special privileges, or in the habit of

[1] General F. A. Walker gives the rate of increase of the native whites in the ited States at 31.25 per cent in the decade 1870–80, but that of native whites rn of native parents at 28 per cent. The average size of the family decreased the same decade from 5.09 persons to 5.04. In 1890 it had further fallen to 3, and in some of the States where the population is most largely native rn it was still lower, *e.g.* Maine (4.40), New Hampshire (4.31), Indiana 60), whereas in the South it was comparatively high, *e.g.* West Virginia 43), Texas (5.44).

deference by one class to another, would imply a revolution national ideas, and a change in what may be called the chemic composition of the national mind, which is of all things t least likely to arrive.

I have left to the last the most difficult problem which meditation on the future of American society raises. Fro those first days of the Republic in which its people realiz that they were Americans and no longer merely English col nists, it has been a question of the keenest interest for the as it is now for the world, when and how and in what for they would develop a distinctively new and truly national ty of character and genius. In 1844 Emerson said, addressi those who had lately seen the coincidence of two fateful ph nomena — the extension of railways into the West and t establishment of lines of swift ocean steamers to Europe —

"We in the Atlantic States by position have been commercial and ha imbibed easily a European culture. Luckily for us, now that steam l narrowed the Atlantic to a strait, the nervous rocky West is intruding new and continental element into the national mind, and we shall have an American genius. We cannot look on the freedom of this co try in connection with its youth without a presentiment that here sh laws and institutions exist on some scale of proportion to the majesty nature. To men legislating for the area between the two oceans, betw the snows and the tropics, somewhat of the gravity of nature will inf itself into the code."

Half a century has passed since these words were spok but many events have intervened to delay that full expressi of the national gifts in letters and arts, as well as in ins tutions, by which a modern people must reveal the pecul nature of its genius. Emerson would doubtless have admitt in 1874 that the West had contributed less of a "new and c tinental element" than he expected, and that the majesty nature had not yet filled Congress with its inspiration. Pr ably another generation must arise, less preoccupied with t task of material development than the two last have be before this expression can be looked for. Europe, wh used to assume in its contemptuous way that neither a nor letters could be expected from commercial America — Charles Lamb said that the whole Atlantic coast figured its to him as one long counter spread with wares — Europe

ow fallen into the opposite error of expecting the develop-
ent of arts and letters to keep pace with and be immediately
orthy of the material greatness of the country. And the
mericans themselves have perhaps, if a stranger may be
rdoned the remark, erred in supposing that they made,
ther in the days of the first settlements or in those when
ey won their independence, an entirely new departure, and
at their new environment and their democratic institutions
ndered them more completely a new people than the children
England, continuing to speak the English tongue and to be
fluenced by European literature, could in truth have been
pected to become. As Protestants have been apt to forget
e traditions of the mediæval Church, and to renounce the
ories of St. Anselm and St. Bernard and Dante, so the
nericans of forty years ago — for this is a mistake which
ey are beginning to outgrow — sought to think of themselves
superior in all regards to the aristocratic society from which
ey had severed themselves, and looked for an elevation in their
aracter and an originality in their literature which neither
e amplitude of their freedom nor the new conditions of their
e could at once produce in the members of an ancient people.
What will be either the form or the spirit of transatlantic
erature and thought when they have fully ripened is a ques-
n on which I do not attempt to speculate, for the forces that
ape literature and thought are the subtlest the historian has
deal with. I return to the humbler task of pointing to
ises whose already apparent power is producing a society
ch as has never yet been seen in Europe. Nowhere in the
rld is there growing up such a vast multitude of intelligent,
tivated, and curious readers. It is true that of the whole
pulation a majority of the men read little but newspapers,
l many of the women little but novels. Yet there remains
number to be counted by millions who enjoy and are moved
the higher products of thought and imagination; and it
st be that as this number continues to grow, each genera-
n rising somewhat above the level of its predecessors, his-
y and science, and even poetry, will exert a power such as
y have never yet exerted over the masses of any country.
d the masses of America seem likely to constitute one-half
civilized mankind. There are those now living who may

see before they die two hundred and fifty millions of m
dwelling between the Atlantic and the Pacific, obeying t
same government, speaking the same tongue, reading the sa
books. A civilized society like this is so much vaster th
any which history knows of, that we can scarcely figure
ourselves what its character will be, nor how the sense of
immensity will tell upon those who address it. The range
a writer's power will be such as no writers have ever yet p
sessed; and the responsibility which goes hand in hand w
the privilege of moving so great a multitude will devolve up
the thinkers and poets of England no less than upon th
of America.

The same progress which may be expected in the enjoym
of literature and in its influence may be no less expected
the other elements of what we call civilization. Manners
becoming in America more generally polished, life more orde
equality between the sexes more complete, the refined ple
ures more easily accessible than they have ever yet b
among the masses of any people. And this civilization atta
a unity and harmony which makes each part of the nat
understand the other parts more perfectly, and enables
intellectual impulse to be propagated in swifter waves of li
than has been the case among the far smaller and more anci
states of Europe.

While this unity and harmony strengthen the cohesion
the Republic, while this diffused cultivation may be expec
to overcome the economic dangers that threaten it, they
not wholly favourable to intellectual creation, or to the v
ety and interest of life. I will try to explain my meaning
describing the impression which stamps itself on the mind
the stranger who travels westward by railway from N
York to Oregon. In Ohio he sees communities which nin
years ago were clusters of log-huts among forests, and wh
are now cities better supplied with all the appliances
refined and even luxurious life than were Philadelphia
New York in those days. In Illinois he sees communi
which were in 1848 what Ohio was in 1805. In the r
States of Dakota and Washington he sees settlements
emerging from a rudeness like that of primitive Ohio or
nois, and reflects that such as Ohio is now, such as Illinoi

st becoming, such in some twenty years more will Dakota
d Washington have become, the process of development
oving, by the help of science, with an always accelerated
eed. "If I return this way thirty years hence," he thinks,
I shall see, except in some few tracts which nature has con-
mned to sterility, nothing but civilization, a highly devel-
ed form of civilization, stretching from the one ocean to the
her; the busy, eager, well-ordered life of the Hudson will be
e life of those who dwell on the banks of the Yellowstone, or
no look up to the snows of Mount Shasta from the valleys of
lifornia." The Far West has hitherto been to Americans
the Atlantic States the land of freedom and adventure and
ystery, the land whose forests and prairies, with trappers
rsuing the wild creatures, and Indians threading in their
noes the maze of lakes, have touched their imagination and
pplied a background of romance to the prosaic conditions
ich surround their own lives. All this will have vanished;
d as the world has by slow steps lost all its mystery since
e voyage of Columbus, so America will from end to end be
the Americans even as England is to the English. What
w background of romance will be discovered? Where will
e American imagination of the future seek its materials
en it desires to escape from dramas of domestic life?
nere will bold spirits find a field in which to relieve their
ergies when the Western world of adventure is no more?
in our globe so in the North American continent, there will
something to regret when all is known and the waters of
ilization have covered the tops of the highest mountains.

He who turns away from a survey of the government and
iety of the United States and tries to estimate the place
y hold in the history of the world's progress cannot repress
light sense of disappointment when he compares what he
observed and studied with that which idealists have
ed for, and Americans have desired to establish. "I have
n," he says, "the latest experiment which mankind have
d, and the last which they can ever hope to try under
ally favouring conditions. A race of unequalled energy
unsurpassed variety of gifts, a race apt for conquest and
the arts of peace, which has covered the world with the
mphs of its sword, and planted its laws in a hundred

islands of the sea, sent the choicest of its children to a n
land, rich with the bounties of nature, bidding them incre
and multiply, with no enemies to fear from Europe, and f
of those evils to eradicate which Europe inherits from
feudal past. They have multiplied till the sapling of t
centuries ago overtops the parent trunk; they have dra
from their continent a wealth which no one dreamed of, th
have kept themselves aloof from Old World strife, and ha
no foe in the world to fear; they have destroyed, after a t
mendous struggle, the one root of evil which the mother co
try in an unhappy hour planted among them. And yet t
government and institutions, as well as the industrial civili
tion of America, are far removed from that ideal comm
wealth which European philosophers imagined, and America
expected to create." The feeling expressed in these words,
often heard from European travellers, is natural to a Europe
who is struck by the absence from America of many of th
springs of trouble to which he has been wont to ascribe t
ills of Europe. But it is only the utterance of the ever-fre
surprise of mankind at the discovery of their own weaknes
and shortcomings. Why should either philosophers in Euro
or practical men in America have expected human nature
change when it crossed the ocean? when history could ha
told them of many ideals not less high and hopes not less c
fident than those that were formed for America which ha
been swallowed up in night. The vision of a golden age
often shimmered far off before the mind of men when th
have passed through some great crisis, or climbed to so
specular mount of faith, as before the traveller when he
reached the highest pastures of the Jura, the line of Alp
snows stands up and glitters with celestial light. Such
vision seen by heathen antiquity still charms us in that fam
poem of Virgil's which was long believed to embody an
spired prophecy. Such another rejoiced the souls of pious n
in the days of Constantine, when the Christian Church,
umphant over her enemies, seemed about to realize the ki
dom of heaven upon earth. Such a one reappeared to
religious reformers of the sixteenth century, who concei
that when they had purged Christianity of its corrupt ac
tions, the world would be again filled with the glory of G

and men order their lives according to His law. And such a vision transported men a century ago, when it was not unnaturally believed that in breaking the fetters by which religious and secular tyranny had bound the souls and bodies of men, and in proclaiming the principle that government sprang from the consent of all, and must be directed to their good, enough had been done to enable the natural virtues of mankind to secure the peace and happiness of nations. Since 1789 many things have happened, and men have become less inclined to set their hopes upon political reforms. Those who still expect a general amelioration of the world from sudden changes look to an industrial and not a political revolution, or seek in their impatience to destroy all that now exists, fancying that from chaos something better may emerge. In Europe, whose thinkers have seldom been in a less cheerful mood than they are to-day, there are many who seem to have lost the old faith in progress; many who feel when they recall the experiences of the long pilgrimage of mankind, that the mountains which stand so beautiful in the blue of distance, touched here by flashes of sunlight and there by shadows of the clouds, will when one comes to traverse them be no Delectable Mountains, but scarred by storms and seamed by torrents, with wastes of stone above, and marshes stagnating in the valleys. Yet there are others whose review of that pilgrimage convinces them that though the ascent of man may be slow it is also sure; that if we compare each age with those which preceded it we find that the ground which seems for a time to have been lost is ultimately recovered, we see human nature growing gradually more refined, institutions better fitted to secure justice, the opportunities and capacities for happiness larger and more varied, so that the error of those who formed ideals never yet attained lay only in their forgetting how much time and effort and patience under repeated disappointment must go to that attainment.

This less sombre type of thought is more common in the United States than in Europe, for the people not only feel in their veins the pulse of youthful strength, but remember the magnitude of the evils they have vanquished, and see that they have already achieved many things which the Old World has longed for in vain. And by so much as the people of the

United States are more hopeful, by that much are they mor healthy. They do not, like their forefathers, expect to attai their ideals either easily or soon; but they say that they wil continue to strive towards them, and they say it with a not of confidence in the voice which rings in the ear of the Euro pean visitor, and fills him with something of their own san guine spirit. America has still a long vista of years stretchin before her in which she will enjoy conditions far more auspi cious than any European country can count upon. And tha America marks the highest level, not only of material well being, but of intelligence and happiness, which the race ha yet attained, will be the judgment of those who look not a the favoured few for whose benefit the world seems hitherto to have framed its institutions, but at the whole body of the people.

APPENDIX

NOTE TO CHAPTER LXI

EXPLANATION (BY MR. G. BRADFORD) OF THE NOMINATING MACHINERY AND ITS PROCEDURE IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS [1]

1. *Ward and City Committees.*— The city is divided into wards by act of the city council prescribed by the legislature (number of wards in the city of Boston, twenty-five). Each ward in its primary meetings appoints a ward committee of not less than three persons for the party: that is, the Republican primary appoints a Republican, and the Democratic primary a Democratic committee with varying number of members. This committee attends to the details of elections, such as printing and distributing notices and posters, canvassing voters, collecting and disbursing money, etc. The ward primaries nominate candidates for the common council of the city (consisting of seventy-two members), who are elected in and must be residents of the ward. The several ward committees constitute the city committee, which is thus a large body (practically a convention), and represents all the wards. The city committee chooses from its members a president, secretary, and treasurer, and each ward committee chooses one of its members as a member of a general executive committee, one for a general finance committee, and one for a general printing committee. The city committee formerly, acting as a convention, nominated the party candidates for the elective offices, which are now the mayor, the aldermen (twelve chosen by districts),[2] the members of the school committee, and the street commissioners. The Democratic city committee does this still; but much dissatisfaction was caused among the Republicans by the fact that wards which had but very few Republican voters had an equal share of power in the city committee, and therefore in making nominations. (It will be seen that in organizing the national convention a similar difficulty has been encountered.) The Republican city committee has therefore ceased to make nominations, but calls upon the wards to send delegates, in proportion to their Republican vote, to a general convention for the nomination of candidates. The party lines are, however, very loosely drawn, especially in cities outside of Boston, and anybody may nominate candidates with chance of success proportional to his efforts.

[1] Copyright by Gamaliel Bradford, 1888.

[2] By an Act of the State Government of 1893, accepted by the voters of Boston, the twelve aldermen are elected at large or on general ticket, instead of by districts, no voter to vote for more than seven aldermen on one ballot, and the twelve having the highest number of votes to be declared elected.

In the towns as apart from the cities, the people, in primary of each party, elect a town committee which corresponds to the ward committees of the city. The town and city committees call the primaries which elect their successors ; and thus the system is kept alive. The city committee may by vote modify the structure, mode of election and functions, both of itself and of the ward committees, but in the town this power lies with the caucus or primary. The above account applies to the city of Boston, but the principles are substantially the same throughout the cities of Massachusetts, the main difference being in thoroughness of organization.

2. *County.* — The county is much less important in New England than in any other part of the country. There are to be chosen, however, county commissioners (three in number, one retiring each year, having charge of roads, jails, houses of correction, registry of deeds, and, in part, of the courts), county treasurer, registrar of deeds, registrar of probate, and sheriff. These candidates are nominated by party conventions of the county, called by a committee elected by the last county convention. The delegates are selected by ward and town primaries at the same time with other delegates.

3. *State.* — First as to representatives to State legislature, 240 in number. The State is districted as nearly as may be in proportion to population. If a ward of a city, or a single town, is entitled to a representative, the party candidate is nominated in the primary, and must be by the Constitution (of the State) a resident in the district. If two or more towns, or two or more wards send a representative in common, the candidate is nominated in cities by a joint caucus of the wards interested called by the ward and city committee, and in the towns by a convention called by a committee elected by the previous convention. The tendency in such cases is that each of these towns or wards shall have the privilege of making nomination in turn of one of its residents.

As regards senators the State is divided into forty districts. The district convention to nominate candidates is called by a committee elected by the preceding convention, and consists of delegates elected by ward and town primaries at the same time with those for State, county, and councillor conventions. Each senatorial district convention elects one member of the State central committee, and, among the Democrats fifteen members at large are added to this central committee by the last preceding State convention.

The convention for nominating members of the governor's council (eight in number) also appoints a committee to call the next convention.

The State convention consists of delegates from ward and town primaries in proportion to their party votes at last elections, and is summoned by the State central committee, consisting of forty members, elected in October by senatorial convention, and taking office on 1st January. The State committee organizes by choice of chairman, secretary, treasurer, and executive committee, who oversee the whole State campaign. The State convention nominates the party candidates for governor

lieutenant-governor, secretary of state, treasurer, auditor, attorney-general.

4. *National.* — First, representatives to Congress. Massachusetts is now (1892) entitled to thirteen, and is divided into thirteen districts. The convention in each district to nominate party candidates is called every two years by a committee elected by the last convention. The delegates from wards and primaries are elected at the same time with the other delegates. As United States senators are chosen by the State legislatures, no nominating convention is needed, though it has been suggested that the nominations might with advantage be made in the State convention, and be morally binding on the party in the legislature. Next are to be chosen, every four years, delegates to the National convention,— that is, under present party customs, two for each senator and representative of the State in Congress. For Massachusetts, therefore, at the present time, thirty. The delegates corresponding to the representative districts are nominated by a convention in each district, called in the spring by the same committee which calls the congressional representative nominating convention in the autumn. The delegates corresponding to senators are chosen at a general convention in the spring, called by the State central committee from wards and primaries, as always; and the thirty delegates at the meeting of the National convention choose the State members of the National committee.

The National convention for nominating party candidates for President, called by a National committee, elected one member by the delegates of each State at the last National convention. The National convention (and this is true in general of all conventions) may make rules for its own procedure and election — as, for example, that all State delegates shall be chosen at large instead of by districts. At the National conventions, especially of the Republicans, complaint has been frequently made, as in the case of city committees, that parts of the country in which there are very few members of the party have yet an undue share of representation in the conventions; but no successful plan has yet been devised for overcoming the difficulty. The National committee manage the party campaign, sending money and speakers to the weaker States, issue documents, collect subscriptions, and dispense general advice.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XC

Some further notion of the character of the Constitution of 1879 may be obtained by referring to the extracts from it, printed at the end of Volume I.

Among the improvements which it introduced may be noted the lengthening of the term of judges of the supreme court from ten to twelve years; the prohibition of lotteries; the perpetual exclusion from the suf-

frage of all persons convicted of any infamous crime, or of the embezzlement or misappropriation of public money; and the placing the State university above the reach of the legislature, which can now neither terminate its existence nor modify its organization. This change has not been found to make the legislature less willing to aid the university. In 1887 an Act was passed imposing a tax of one cent upon every $100 of taxable property, to be applied for the support of the University of California. Nor has the provision (Art. ix. § 6) that the revenue derived from the State school fund and State school tax should be "devoted exclusively to the support of primary and grammar schools," been found to work badly for secondary education, since it has rather induced the cities to make a more liberal provision than they formerly did for schools of the higher type out of local taxation.

REMARKS BY MR. DENIS KEARNEY ON "KEARNEYISM IN CALIFORNIA"

After the appearance of the first edition of this book I received a letter from Mr. Denis Kearney, making remarks on some of the statements contained in the chapter entitled "Kearneyism in California." This letter is unfortunately too long to be inserted as a whole; and it does not seem to me seriously to affect the tenor of the statements contained in that chapter, which my Californian informants, on whom I can rely, declare to be quite correct. Mr. Kearney's version of what happened varies from that which I have followed. I have, however, in a few passages slightly modified the text of the former edition; and I give here such extracts from Mr. Kearney's letter as seem sufficient to let his view of his own conduct be fairly and fully set forth. As he responded to my invitation to state his case, made in reply to a letter of remonstrance from him, I am anxious that all the justice I can do him should be done.

Pages 431. — "In September, 1877, immediately after the general State municipal, and congressional elections, I called a meeting of workingmen and others to discuss publicly the propriety of permanently organizing for the purpose of holding the politicians up to the pledges made to the people before election. . . . I made up my mind that if our civilization — California civilization — was to continue, Chinese immigration must be stopped, and I saw in the people the power to enforce that 'must.' Hence the meeting. This meeting resolved itself into a permanent organization, and 'resoluted' in favour of a 'red-hot' agitation. was, in spite of my earnest protests, elected President of this new organization, with instructions from the meeting to 'push the organization throughout the city and State without delay. Our aim was to press Congress to take action against the Chinese at its next sitting. . . . I did not sympathize with the July meeting of 1877, which was called to expres

ympathy with the men on strike in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. I am pposed to strikes in a Republic, where the ballot of a millionaire's ardener or coachman cancels that of their master. . . . The part that I ook in the municipal election, mentioned in page 391 [now 431], was rought about in this way. I owned a prosperous draying business, and vas an influential member of the Draymen's Union. The streets of our ity were in a horrible condition, almost impassable, making it very ifficult for teams to haul any kind of a load to and from the distributing entres. The money appropriated for their repair by the taxpayers was quandered by the men elected to see that it was honestly spent. The)raymen's Union, for self-protection, went into municipal politics and lemanded that we be given the superintendence of streets."

Page 432. — "True I am not one of the literati, that is to say, a pro-essor of degrees and master of languages, although I can speak more han one. For more than thirty years I have been a great reader and lose student of men and measures. No *Chronicle* reporter ever wrote r dressed up a speech for me. They did the reverse; always made it a oint to garble and misrepresent. It was only when the *Chronicle* saw here it could make a hit that it spread out a speech. To illustrate, if I ttacked a monopoly whose rottenness the *Chronicle* shielded for money, then would garble and misrepresent that speech; but if I attacked an nstitution the *Chronicle* wanted to blackmail, the speech would be given n full once or twice, or they would keep it up until 'seen.'"

Page 432. — (Meeting on Nob Hill.)

"I did not use any such language as is imputed to me. Nob Hill is the entre of the Sixth Ward, and I advertised for the meeting there to rganize the Sixth Ward Club. We had bonfires at all our meetings so s to direct the people where to go. . . . No such construction could have een put upon the language used in my speech of that evening. The olice authorities had shorthand reporters specially detailed to take down ly speeches verbatim. . . . I was not arrested on account of the Nob ill meeting. I cannot now tell without looking up the matter how many mes I was arrested. At last the authorities, finding their efforts to reak up the movement of no avail, decided to proclaim the meetings *à la* alfour in Ireland. Upon the heels of the proclamation to stop our ectings came another from the Governor calling for an election to fill vacancy in the legislature in the aristocratic district of Alameda. Taking dvantage of the situation, I went into the district, organized and carried against a combination of both Democrats and Republicans. This gave s a standing in the field of politics, and frightened the authorities, who hen and there withdrew opposition to the new movement."

Page 435. — "Shortly after the election of the delegates I made a tour the United States, speaking everywhere to immense audiences and rging that they petition Congress to stop Chinese immigration. . . . My ip was a brilliant success. In less than a year I had succeeded in lifting e Chinese from a local to a great national question. This also disputes e statement that my trip East was a failure."

Page 441. — ("Since 1880 he has played no part in Californian po tics.")

"This is true to this extent. I stopped agitating after having shov the people their immense power, and how it could be used. The Chine question was also in a fair way of being solved. The plains of this Sta were strewn with the festering carcasses of public robbers. I was poo with a helpless family, and I went to work to provide for their comfor Common sense would suggest that if I sought office, or the emolumen of office, I could easily have formed combinations to be elected eith governor of my State or United States senator."

Page 435 ("hoodlums and other ragamuffins who formed the first San Lot meetings.")

"It was only when the city authorities, who while persecuting u either hired all of the halls or frightened their owners or lessees into n allowing us to hire them, that we were driven to the Sand Lots. these early meetings we sometimes had to raise from $500 to $1000 carry on the agitation inside and outside the courts. If, then, the aud ences were composed of hoodlums and ragamuffins, how could we ha raised so much money at a single meeting?"

Page 440. — "I also dispute some of the statements therein. All of t bills of the first session of the Legislature under the new Constituti were declared unconstitutional by the State Supreme Court on accou of the little scheming jokers tucked away in them. The Anti-Chine Bills that were passed, — and all introduced were passed, — were d clared by the Federal judges as in conflict with the United States Co stitution. I advocated the adoption of the new Constitution, and deliver one hundred and thirty speeches in that campaign. The San Francis papers sent correspondents with me. The very prominence of the qu tions threw me into the *foreground*, so that I had to stand the brunt the battle, and came very near being assassinated for my pains."

Page 443. — "I don't quite understand what you mean by the 'so classes.' The money-lenders, land monopolists, and those who we growing rich by importing and employing Chinese labourers were agai me, and did all in their power to kill both the movement and myself. . My only crime seems to have been that I opposed the Mongolization my State in the interest of our own people and their civilization. I nev received a dollar from public office or private parties for my servic They were gratuitous, and have secured me, I am sure, the esteem of t majority of my fellow-citizens, among whom I am still not witho influence."

INDEX

Ability, practical, in America goes into business, ii. 72
Abolition, and the Republican party, ii. 30
Absence of a capital, ii. 791
Achæan League, i. 23, 36, 72, 259, 350, 357
Act of Settlement (English), i. 216, 241
Adams, C. F., "The Centennial Milestone" quoted, i. 615
Adams, H. B., "The College of William and Mary" cited, i. 618
Adams, John (President), i. 41, 42, 44, 78, 92, 275; ii. 7, 131, 176
Adams, J. Q. (President), i. 47, 83, 88; ii. 177, 229
Adams, Samuel, Hosmer's Life of, i. 595
"Administrative Law" of France, i. 244
Alaska, i. 578; ii. 180
Albany, the people's representative at, and the farmers, ii. 239
Aldermen, i. 625; ii. 92; (New York), 163, 240
Aliens, allowed to vote, i. 327; recent Alien Acts declared unconstitutional, 335
Ambassadors, appointment of, i. 53
Amendments to the Federal Constitution, i. 27, 55, 101, 126, 235, 329, 364–371, 697, 702, 705, 706, 708–710; to State Constitutions, 469
America, rapid changes in, i. 2; a commonwealth of commonwealths, 17; a country full of change and movement, ii. 28; intense faith of its people in, 350
"American," meaning of the term, i. 20
American and European systems compared: in the proportion of first-rate ability engaged in politics, i. 79, 80; position of the President, 91; Congress, 99, 148, 184, 197, 201, 277 *sqq.*; contrast with the Cabinet system, 277–297; ii. 221; defects of the frame of government, i. 307; fear of foreign aggression, 307; the foundations of party, ii. 16; types of statesmen, 228; general interest in politics, 269; proportion of urban to rural population. 279, ii. 863; faith in the people, i. 283; education, 284; classes, 293 *sqq.*; aversion to constructive legislation, 355; *laissez faire*, 535; stability, 594; religious equality, 695; influence of religion, 714 *sqq.*; position of women, 728 *sqq.*; intellectual productivity, 768; charm of life, 808 *sqq.*; its uniformity, 816
"American Commonwealths" Series, i. 412
American Constitution. *See* Constitution
American dislike of humbug, ii. 243
American experience, incomparable significance of, i. 2; applied to European problems, 185, 504; ii. 607–614, 628–631, 710, 711
American Government. *See* Federal System
American history, rich in political instruction, i. 5
American life, its pleasantness, ii. 808; causes of this, 814; its uniformity, seen in nature, 816; in the cities, 818; exceptions to this, 819; want of history, 821; uniformity of institutions, 822; of persons, *ib.*; causes of this, 825; promise of the future, 827
American oratory, ii. 799. *See* Oratorical excellence
American philanthropy, ii. 723

American Protestant Episcopal Church and its liturgy, i. 15
American statesmen, types of, ii. 228
American Union more than an aggregate of States, i. 17
Americans: hopefulness of, an antidote to grave political dangers, i. 10; their national characteristics, ii. 281; good nature, *ib.*; humour, 282, 814; hopefulness, 282; faith in the people, 283, 368, 603; education, 284; morality, 285; religion, 286; want of reverence, *ib.*; business, 287; want of sustained thought, 288; shrewdness, 289, 306; impressionability, 289; unsettledness, *ib.*; sympathy, 290; changefulness, 291; conservatism, *ib.*; characteristics of different classes, 293–306; their individualism, 540; speculative character, 661; salient intellectual features, 760, 768; recent developments of thought, 777; want of brilliant personalities, 779; intellectual relation to Europe, 781; opinion of themselves, *ib.*; intellectual promise for the future, 789; their oratory, 799; reserve of audiences, 805; charm of their character, 813; character of the Western States, 828; future of their political institutions, 840; growing modesty, 848; social and economic future, 854; influence of immigrants upon them, 862; their place in the history of the world's progress, 869
Anglo-American race, intrinsic excellence of, i. 28; political genius of, *ib.*
Anglophobia, Irish in America retain their hereditary, ii. 368
Annapolis, convention at, 1786, i. 21
Ann Arbor (Univ. of Michigan), ii. 674, 689
Annual letter of Secretary of the Treasury, i. 176
Anson, "Law and Custom of the Constitution" cited, i. 283
Appropriation bills, i. 213
Aristotle quoted, i. 11
Arizona, Territory of, i. 580, 583, 587
Arkansas, pronunciation of name of State, i. 118; Constitution of, 687
Arkansas, great cañon of river, ii. 64
Army, control of, i. 33, 53; smallnes of, ii. 525
"Articles of Confederation and Pe petual Union" of 1781, i. 21, 22, 38 690–696
Assemblies, modern deliberative comparatively small, ii. 223
Assessments, levying of on Federa officials forbidden, ii. 204
Athens, Democrats of, i. 196; general of, 217; Assembly, 220; politics i ii. 57, 222, 288, 310
Arthur, President, ii. 140
Attorney-General, the, i. 87, 89
"Back-Pay Grab," the, of 1873, i. 1
Bagehot, Walter, quoted, i. 287
Baltimore, City of, election frauds i ii. 103
Ballot, Australian system in force i most of the States, ii. 144, 324
Balloting in convention, mode of, ii. 1
Balance of power in the Federal Co stitution, i. 222–227, 400; ii. 266, 2
Bank, United States, i. 291, 375, 379
Bar, the American: its influence public opinion, i. 266; on the jud ciary, 508; the legal profession und vided in America, ii. 302, 618, 62 no general organization, 622; pr vision for legal education, 623; co servatism of the Bar, 619; decli in its political influence, 625; and its social position, 626; its mor influence, 628; reflections on t fusion of the two branches, *ib* forensic oratory, 802
Beaconsfield Government, i. 287
Beecher, H. Ward, influence on ele tions, ii. 207, 709
Belgian courts, referred to, i. 251
Belgian parliamentary system, i. 9 Constitution, 359
Bemis's "Local Government in Mic gan," i. 606–607
Bench, the, ii. 632; American Sta ii. 609. *See* Judiciary
Bernheim, A. C., on Primary Electio ii. 102
Best men, why they do go into po tics, ii. 69–75

Betting, speculating, etc., ii. 662
Bill of Rights (English), i. 241
Bill or Declaration of Rights of 1791, embodied in Constitution, i. 28; contained germ of Civil War, *ib.*; referred to, 366, 697, 706; in State Constitutions, 438–442, 711
Bills, Congressional, always private bills, i. 168
Bills, Government, in England, their policy carefully weighed, i. 166
Bills, House and Senate, i. 136
Bishop, J. B., on "Money in City Elections," i. 543; ii. 168
Blackstone, Mr. Justice, quoted, i. 29, 281, 445
Blaine, J. G., i. 44, 127; ii. 45, 182, 200, 208, 225, 227
"Bolters," ii. 329, 333
"Bosses," ii. 109–130; "Bosses *v.* European demagogues, 114; Bosses, 166–174, 389, 397, 398, 405 *sqq.*
Boston, City of, i. 630; ii. 819, 875
Boycotting, ii. 339
Bradford, Mr. Gamaliel, on the nominating machinery of Massachusetts, ii. 875
Bribery and corruption, i. 462; ii. 144, 146–149, 150–153, 238, 589, 591, 638
Bribery in Congress, ii. 164
Brigandage, ii. 832
British Colonies, self-governing, i. 93, 277; governors in, irremovable by the Colony, 277
British Columbia, ii. 528, 529
British immigrants, ii. 34
Brooklyn, City of, Charter, i. 656; population of, and city, referred to, 652; bribery in, ii. 147
Bryn Mawr College for women, ii. 690
Buchanan, President, i. 84, 338; ii. 157
Bugbee, J. M., on City Government of Boston, i. 630
Burr, Aaron, i. 47

CABINET, the President's, i. 86–96; ii. 157
Cabinet, the, system of government, i. 279 *sqq.*
Cabinet-government, English, i. 278
Cæsarism, improbability of, in America, i. 68; ii. 574
Calhoun, John C., i. 84; ii. 14, 177, 802
California, State of, Constitution, i. 471, 476, 711–724; ii. 186, 437, 621; character of the State, 425; Kearneyism, 429 *sqq.*; 878
Campaign committees, ii. 83
Canada, Constitution of, referred to, i. 249, 385, 473, 684; ii. 137; relations of, to the United States, 526, 527
Canada, Supreme Court of, i. 265
Candidates for office in England now mainly chosen by the party organizations, ii. 81; interrogating them for pledges, 326
Capital, influence of a, upon society, ii. 791; want of one in the United States, *ib.*; causes of this, 795; its results, 796
Capitalists, class of, ii. 300, 745; attack upon, 437
Carlisle, Mr., i. 150
Carolina, North, State of, i. 26, 414, 519
Carolina, South, i. 43, 197; and State rights, i. 389; defies Congress, i. 403
"Carpet-baggers" in the South, i. 349; ii. 163, 240, 476 *sqq.*
Carthaginian Councils, encroachments of, i. 226
Catholics, Roman, and politics, ii. 699, 709
Caucus, Party, in Congress, i. 119, 205, 206
Central Pacific R. R., ii. 651
Chambers, Second, American view of, i. 185; ii. 610
Chancery Courts, i. 501
Charles I. and the English Parliament, i. 261
Charleston, Democratic convention of 1860, at, ii. 185
Chase, Mr., i. 88
Chase, Judge Samuel, impeachment of, i. 230, 268
Chicago, City of, Republican national convention, of 1880, and 1884, at, ii. 184; of 1860, 222
Chicago World's Fair Exhibition, of 1893, inventiveness and taste of the buildings of, ii. 788
Chinese in America, the, i. 724; ii. 41, 49, 298, 439, 444; case of indignity to, 331; attacks on, 335

Church and State, separation of, in America, ii. 601, 695 *sqq.*; reasons for it, 700; legal position of a church, 702; result to religion, 712; to society in general, 812
Churches and clergy, the, ii. 695–713
Cincinnati, City of, ii. 121
Circuit Courts, i. 231
Cities, debts of, i. 526, 636–638; their relation to townships, 595, 608, 663; their growth, 622; their organization, 623 *sqq.*; indraught towards them from the country, ii. 863. *See* Municipal Government.
"Citizen's" (or "Independent") ticket in voting, ii. 143
Citizenship of the United States, i. 419, 709; ii. 100
City governments, necessity for control over, i. 537
Civil Service Reform, i. 646; ii. 27, 59, 139–141, 161, 609; Act of 1883, 847
Civil Service, the, ii. 609
Civil War, what it settled, i. 337.
Classes in America as influencing opinion, ii. 293; the farmers, 294; shopkeepers, 296; working men, *ib.*; city residuum, 299; capitalists, 300; professional men, 302; literary men, 304; summary, 305; no class struggles, 599
Clay, Henry, i. 47, 70; ii. 12–14, 182, 234, 373
Clergy, the American, and politics, ii. 207, 329, 416, 699, 709; their equality, 695 *sqq.*; their social standing, 707
Cleveland, Grover (President), i. 44, 59, 209; ii. 45, 46, 182, 194, 209, 225
Clinton, Governor, i. 41; ii. 132, 176
Closure of debate in Congress, i. 133–136
Coast survey department, i. 90
Co-education, ii. 733
Coinage Act of 1873, i. 180
Collisions between Congress and Senate, i. 186, 188
Colonists, early, elements of diversity as well as of unity among them, i. 24
Colorado, State of, i. 431, 485, 687
Columbia Coll., New York, ii. 671, 672
Columbia, Federal District of, i. 578; ii. 180
Commerce Commission, Inter-State, i 647
Commerce, power of regulating, i. 3
Commercial distress, 1783–1786, i. 21
Committee of Appropriations, i. 17 179
"Committee of Conference," i. 187
Committee of Ways and Means, i. 14 176, 179
Committee on Credentials in par conventions, ii. 86, 104
Committee on Rivers and Harbour i. 177
Committees of Congress, i. 113, 13 149, 154–164, 176, 177
Common Councils, i. 625
Commons, House of. *See* House Commons
Competitive examinations, ii. 139
Complexity of American institution i. 17
Confederate States, Constitution 1861, i. 683
Confederation of 1781, i. 20, 690
Congress of 1754 at Albany, i. 19; 1765 at New York, 20; of 1774–17 at Philadelphia, 20, 21, 155
Congress of the United States, esta lished by the Constitution of 178 i. 35, 36, 697; its relation to t President, 57, 59, 93, 208–214, 2 288; its powers, 61, 699; comm tees, 113, 140, 155, 176, 179; criticis of its legislation, 168; of its finan 174; the division into two chambe 183; their substantial identity character, 184; collisions betwe the two, 186; influence of local fe ing in elections, 189; comparis with the English system, 191; sa ries of members, 194; short ten of office, 195; and short duration a Congress, 196; its numbers, 1 good attendance of members, 1 want of opportunities for disti tion, 199; absence of leaders, 2 party caucuses, 205; want of a c sistent policy, 206, 302; few open re tions with the executive, 208; con over the latter, 210; power of purse, 212; cannot dismiss an c cial, *ib.*; and supreme power in

government, 227; the Constitution out of the reach of Congress, 242; statutes passed *ultra vires*, 246; proposed veto on State legislation, 257; defects in the structure and working of Congress summarized, 300; its relations to the electors, 302; "concurrent legislation," 328; electoral franchise, 395; origin of the system, 670; private bills in Congress, 675; "lobbying," 462; ii. 157, 162; how far Congress is corrupt, 157; congressional caucus for the early Presidential elections, 176; checks on the tyranny of the majority, 336; congressional oratory, 802; the future of Congress, 845
Congressional encroachment, distrust of, i. 59
Congressional Record, i. 145
Congressman, term explained, i. 148
Conkling, Roscoe, i. 63
Connecticut, State of, i. 19, 197, 429, 431, 481, 505, 513
Constitution (Federal) of 1789, difficulty of framing it, i. 22; an instrument of compromise, 25; opposition to its ratification, 26; fear of European aggression led to its adoption, 27; original amendments to, *ib.*; causes of its excellence, 29; its double aspect, 32; the complement and crown of the State Constitutions, 33; functions of government it provides for, *ib.*; objects of its framers, 34, 222, 310, 318; ii. 265; creation of two chambers by, i. 183; scheme of, tends to put stability above activity, 114; oath of allegiance to it, 1, 130; balance of power it provides for, 222, 406; ii. 266, 267; its relation to Congress, i. 242; to the Courts, 243 *sqq.*; respect felt for it, 256, 311; Puritanic element in it, 306; its success, 310; peculiar distribution of governmental functions, 315; remarkable omissions, 318, 322; limits the competence of Congress, 336; its development, 361; by amendment, 364; by interpretation and construction, 372; by legislation, 392; by usage, 393; collisions with the executive or legislature, 397; results of this development, 400; services of the Constitution to the nation, 406; provisions it owes to State constitutions, 670; the Constitution given at length, 697–710
Constitution of California, i. 711
Constitution of Confederate States of 1861, i. 683
Constitution of North American colonies, i. 19, 429; of 1777, 19
Constitutions of the States, i. 30; their history, 427, 477; mode of alteration, 432; their real nature, 433; their contents, 436; confusion of provisions, 443; less capacity for expansion than in the Federal Constitution, 444; their development, 450; types of constitutions, 453; their length, 454; growth of democratic tendencies, 455; comparative frequency of change, 456; jealousy of officials, 459; protection of private property, *ib.*; extension of State interference, 461; penalties not always enforced, *ib.*; legislation by a Constitution, 463; its demerits and its advantages, 472; constitutional conventions, 476
Constitutions, rigid or written, i. 30, 35, 36, 37, 60, 66, 101, 360, 383, 397, 402, 405, 407, 686; ii. 595, 610; contrasted with flexible constitutions, i. 360, 396
Constitutional Amendments, i. 27, 55, 101, 126, 235, 329, 364–371, 469, 695, 706–710
Constitutional Conventions. *See* Conventions
Continental Congress of 1774 at Philadelphia, i. 19
Convention (Constitutional) of 1786 at Annapolis, i. 21; of 1787 at Philadelphia, 22–24, 30, 95, 183, 215, 223, 282, 312, 325, 667–669; ii. 5, 267; of different States, i. 26, 27, 667–669
Conventions, Note on Constitutional, i. 667; nominating, ii. 82, 104, 875; National, 82; their evolution, 175, 220; composition, 178; working, 181; objects, 185; classes of aspirants, 187; complexity of their motives, 189; preliminary work, *ib.*; open-

ing of the Convention, 190; the voting, 196; effect of the system upon public life, 221; their tempestuous character, 222
Cooley, T. M. (Judge), quoted, i. 55, 309, 313, 336, 339, 375, 383, 399, 681
Cooley's "Constitutional Limitations," quoted, i. 233, 446, 448, 470, 526, 555, 681
Cooley's "History of Michigan," cited, i. 383, 404
Cooley's "Principles of Constitutional Law," quoted, i. 233, 236, 314, 420
"Copperheads," the, ii. 32
Copyright, i. 33; International, ii. 324–325, 774
Cornell University, Ithaca, ii. 671, 672
Corporations in America, i. 449, 715; ii. 855
Corruption, ii. 154 165, 238. *See* Bribery
County organization, i. 597, 598, 599, 604, 608, 611; ii. 876
Courtesy of the Senate, i. 62
Court of Claims, i. 239
Creative intellectual power, ii. 767. *See* Intellectual productivity
"Croker Correspondence," the, i. 280
Currency, control of the, i. 33; currency question, a source of disquiet, ii. 356

Dakota, State of, i. 125, 442, 486, 554, 584
"Dark Horse," meaning of the term, ii. 187; referred to, 200
Dartmouth College v. *Woodward*, i. 686
Darwin, the "struggle for existence," and political strife, i. 401
Debt, National, i. 176, 181; public debts of States, 523, 723; of cities, 527, 637
Declaration of Independence, the i. 30, 92, 307, 438; ii. 357, 551
Deficiency Bill, i. 179
Degrees and examinations, University, ii. 678
Delaware, State of, i. 124, 414, 439, 486
Demagogues, influence of, ii. 578
Democracies, and the control of foreign policy, i. 107, 221, 343; charged with fickleness, 456; and the judiciary, 504; ii. 636; "rotation in office," 133; may be tested by the statesmen produced, 228; the strength of popular government: its excellence, 260; two dangers to which it is exposed, *ib.*; safeguards against these, 261; its educative power, *ib.*; democracy and State interference, 540 *sqq.*; chief faults attributed to democracies, 563; how far these are present in America, 564; their true faults, 581–593; how far observable in America, 584; necessity of reverence and self-control, 727; effect of social equality upon manners, 754; on thought, 757 *sqq.*; profusion of speech due to democracy, 801; not rightly charged with producing uniformity of character, 835
Democracy in America, and the judiciary, i. 504, 510; and rotation in office, ii. 133; tested by the statesmen it produces, 228 *sqq.*; its educative influence, 366; its supposed faults examined, 563; weakness, 564; fickleness, 565; insubordination, 566; jealousy of greatness, 574; tyranny of the majority, 576; love of novelty, 577; influence of demagogues, 578; its true faults, 581 *sqq.*; its merits, 594; stability, *ib.*; obedience to law, 596; consistency of political ideas, 597; restrictions on officials, 598; no class struggles, 599, 603; energetic use of natural resources, 601; latent vigour of the government, 602; spirit of fraternity, 604; application of American experience to Europe, 607–614; influence of democracy on the position of women, 742; spirit of equality 744, 797; its influence on manners 754; influence of democracy on American thought, 761 *sqq.*; on the pleasantness of life, 810; on uniformity, 825; its future, 840; democracy and the approaching economic struggle, 851
Democratic party, the, of 1793 (or Republicans), i. 42; ii. 6; of 1829 i. 268; ii. 12, 16, 18–21, 26–40, 180 intelligent adherents of, 33

Denominational Census (1890), ii. 704, 718
Desty's "Constitution Annotated," quoted, i. 329
Dicey's "Law of the Constitution," quoted, i. 244
Distinguished men, want of, in America, i. 78–85, 200, 201; ii. 51, 69 *sqq.*, 235, 591, 613, 779
District Courts, i. 231
Divisions in Congress, mode of taking, i. 132
Divorce in the United States, increasing: more frequent in the West, ii. 724
Domestic service, aversion of Americans to enter, ii. 752
Dred Scott decision, i. 253, 263, 269, 386; ii. 14, 15

Eaton, D. B., on "Primary Elections," ii. 102
Education, Bureau of, i. 90, 614
Education, legal, provision for, ii. 623
Education, public, in America, i. 460, 617; higher education and politics, ii. 252: public, ii. 284, 316, 663 *sqq.*, 729, 746
Elections, influence of local feeling in, i. 189–193; question of annual elections, 197; winning of the work of politics, ii. 62; their machinery, 142 *sqq.*; fraudulent practices, 145–153, 210–212, 240, 591; cost of elections, 127; a corrupt district of New York State, 148; machinery in Massachusetts, 737; elections the instrument of government by public opinion, 325
Elections, Presidential, i. 38, 72, 298; nominating conventions, ii. 175; the campaign, 203; enthusiasm evoked, 224; disputed election of 1876, 595
Eliot, C. W., on the material development of the United States, ii. 601
Elliott's "Debates," quoted, i. 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 41, 95, 102, 111, 196, 256, 279, 360
Emerson, R. W., quoted, ii. 866
England, former American hatred of, i. 24; ii. 785; growing friendliness to, 527, 785
England and America compared; the judiciary, i. 35, 229, 240, 273; ii. 632; Parliamentary system, i. 35, 56, 86, 93, 97, 98, 121, 129 *sqq.*, 136, 137, 147, 149, 165, 197, 201, 277, 473; royal prerogative, 56, 59, 70, 74, 127, 197; elections, i. 71, 74, 127, 192; ii. 77, 90, 172, 218; the cabinet, i. 86, 89, 90; parties, 149; ii. 21, 39, 137; finance, i. 174; whips, 202; interpretation of statutes, 250, 259, 264; relations of executive and legislature, 277; universities, 682; ii. 666; "referendum," i. 467; municipal government, 570, 575; counties, 597, 612; sanitation, 617; politicians, ii. 55, 61, 70; corruption, 163, 238; political morality, 241; public opinion, 247, 250, 268, 270 *sqq.*, 317 *sqq.*, 371; classes, 293; government interference, 541 *sqq.*; the Bar, 617; power of wealth, 749; intellectual productivity, 771, 778; liberty, 782; oratory, 799
English Acts of Parliament, mode of interpretation by the judges, i. 251
English borough-owning magnates, ii. 235
English common and statute law, taken by the United States as a model, i. 346
English Constitution, referred to, i. 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 39, 51, 56, 60, 174, 216, 241, 254, 258, 277, 360, 387, 393, 396, 402, 445; ii. 283
English counties, formerly independent kingdoms, now local administrative areas, i. 16
English Crown, antiquity of, i. 216; independent part of the Constitution, 219
English kings, formerly present in Parliament, i. 209
English moralities in public life, ii. 241, 243
English Parliament, omnipotent, i. 242; cited, ii. 318
English parties, ii. 22
Equality, senses of the word, ii. 744; inequality of wealth in America, *ib.*; social equality, 747; effect on manners, 754; its charm, 810

Equalization, Board of, i. 514, 629
European aggression, fear of, i. 27
European statesmen, representative types, ii. 231
European travellers, and the study of the State Governments of America, i. 411
Exchequer, Chancellor of (English), his budget, i. 174
Executive, American: influence of public opinion on it, ii. 266; its latent vigour, 602. *See* Cabinet, President, Senate
Executive and Legislative departments, separated by the American Constitution, i. 90, 91, 178, 208 *sqq.*, 215 *sqq.*; their relations under the European cabinet system, 277 *sqq.*; struggles between them in England, 287; and in America, 288; results of their separation, 292; danger of making legislature supreme, i. 664; separation not essential to democracy, ii. 587

Farmers' Alliance, the, i. 573; ii. 41, 44
Farmers in America, characteristics of, ii. 293
Fatalism of the multitude, ii. 344, 349
"Favourite," meaning of the term, ii. 187
"Favourite Son," ii. 187
Federal Courts. *See* Judiciary (Federal)
Federal Government, the: its chief functions, i. 33, 316; limitations on its powers, 36, 37, 317; its several departments: the President, 38; Cabinet, 86; Senate, 96; House of Representatives, 124; the legislature and executive, 215; the judiciary, 228; "concurrent powers," 316; working relations with the State governments, 325; intervention in disturbances, 330; its relations to individual citizens, 330; cases of resistance, 334; coercion of a State impossible, 338; the determination of its powers, 378; lines of their development, 380; results of the latter, 400
Federalist party, the, i. 42, 92, 337; ii 6–12, 176
Federalist, The, quoted, i. 30, 87, 112 191, 197, 198, 229, 235, 255, 282, 393
Federal System of America, the; it main features, i. 312; distributio of powers, 313, 697 *sqq.*; omissio in the Constitution, 322; indestructi bility of the Union, 323; working o the system, 325; criticism of it, 342 its merits, 350; causes of its stabil ity, 357; dominance of the central izing tendencies, 403; its future, i 328, 684
Federal System of Canada, i. 684
Federal System of the English Uni versities, i. 682
Federal Union of 1789, parallels to i. 23
Federation, faults attributed to, i. 342 their merits as illustrated by Amer ica, 350
Female Suffrage. *See* Woman Suffrage
"Fifteenth Amendment," i. 126, 318 327, 710
Financial bills in England, i. 174 mode of passing them in America 176–180; results of the system, 180 reason for it, 180; flourishing finan cial condition of America, 181; yearl surpluses, 181; the paying off of th national debt, 181; State finance 512–527
Fletcher v. *Peck*, i. 257
Florida, sale of, by Spain, i. 27; Con stitution of, 497
Foreign relations, control of, i. 33, 5 106–109; discontinuity of policy, 7 difficulty of control by popular a semblies, 220; division of powers i America, 224; faults due to the Fe eral system, 342; influence of publ opinion, ii. 371; and territorial e tension, 521; and of the America spirit of fraternity, 605
Forensic oratory, ii. 802. *See* Orato ical excellence
France, sale of Louisiana by, i. 2 intellectual relations to America, i 785
Franklin, Benjamin, i. 22, 194
Fraternity, spirit of, in America, ii. 6

Freedom of discussion in America, ii. 350
Freeman, Prof. E. A., quoted, i. 72
Free trade and protection, i. 176; ii. 26, 47
Free Traders, ii. 48
Free Soilers" party, ii. 14, 30
Fremont, General, ii. 14, 178
French Canadians in New England, i. 595; ii. 36, 367
French Chamber, ii. 223
French Constitution and Government referred to, i. 60, 74, 91, 197, 221, 244, 250, 287, 371; ii. 258
French Constitution of 1791, referred to, i. 60, 295
French Senate, i. 97, 197
Fundamental orders of Connecticut, of 1638, the oldest political Constitution in America, i. 429
Future, the intellectual, of America, ii. 779, 780
Future, the, of American political institutions, ii. 840; of the Federal system, *ib.*; of Congress, the executive, the judiciary, 844; of the Presidency, 845; of the party system, 846; of the spoils system and the machine, *ib.*; the democracy and the approaching economic struggle for existence, 850
uture, the social and economic, of America, ii. 854; great fortunes, *ib.*; corporations, 856; changes in population, 858; the negroes, 859; question of the evolution of an American type of character, 861, 862; tendency towards city life, 863; the development of an aristocracy improbable, 865; future of literature and thought, 866; of other elements of civilization, 868

ALLATIN, Albert, i. 89
arfield, J. A. (President), i. 46, 52, 63, 64, 192; ii. 138, 182, 188, 200
eneral Court of Massachusetts, i. 539
eneral election in England, a period of disturbance, i. 71
General Ticket" system of voting, i. 43
George III. and English pocket boroughs, i. 281; and "place," ii. 134
George, Henry, the Labour party candidate for mayor, ii. 42; referred to, 248
Georgia, State of, i. 183, 235, 258, 269; and the Supreme Court, i. 403; and pensions, 513; and a second chamber, 670
German Constitution, referred to, i. 220; ii. 258
Germanic Confederation, i. 16, 350; ii. 332
German immigrants in America, ii. 34, 35, 36, 299, 786
Germany and America, intellectual relation of, ii. 787
Gerry, Elbridge, i. 124
Gilman, President (Johns Hopkins University), on degrees for women, ii. 678
Goschen, Mr., on *laissez faire*, ii. 540
Government, forms of, in free countries, i. 277; ii. 264; their influence upon national character, ii. 365, 758
Governors, State. *See* State Executive
Granger movement, the, ii. 435, 646
Grant, U. S. (President), i. 45, 46, 64, 68, 78, 84, 214, 276; ii. 182, 370
Great men, why not chosen as Presidents, i. 78, *sqq.*
Greece, ancient, constitutions of, referred to, i. 23, 36, 72, 217, 220, 259, 361, 368, 574; ii. 150, 222, 265
Greeley, Horace, ii. 178, 273
Greenbackers, the (party of), ii. 39, 40, 41, 44, 47, 212
Guelfs and Ghibellines, wars of, ii. 24

Habeas Corpus, suspension of, i. 55.
Hamilton, Alexander, i. 23, 25, 30, 39, 47, 63, 89, 92, 99, 100, 111, 208, 229, 235, 667; ii. 6–8, 11, 14, 19, 33, 222, 234
Hanseatic League, i. 16, 350, 575
Hare's "American Constitutional Law," quoted, i. 338, 379, 387
Harrington, author of "Oceana," quoted, i. 37, 103
Harrison, Benjamin (President), ii. 183

Hart, Prof. A. B., "Practical Essays on American Government," ii. 151
Hartford Convention of 1814, i. 388; ii. 11
Hartington, Lord, ii. 221
Harvard University, ii. 670
Hastings, Warren, i. 50
Hawaii, Constitution of, i. 684; relations of the island to the United States, ii. 532–533
Hawaii, rising of 1892, ii. 533
Hayes, R. B. (President), i. 48–50, 214, 330; ii. 139
Henry, Patrick, i. 307
Hereditary titles, i. 701; ii. 753
History, its services to politics, ii. 607
Hitchcock's "State Constitutions" quoted, i. 554; ii. 650
Holker, Lord Justice, case of, i. 271
Home of the Nation, the, ii. 449–468; phenomena, racial, climatic, and economical, of the New World, 449; relation of geographical conditions to national growth, 450; influence of physical environment, 451; physical characteristics, 452; climate an historical factor, 453; aridity of the West, 454; influence of early colonial and frontier life on the national character, *ib.*; early European settlements in America, 455; settlement of the Mississippi basin and the unity of the nation, 457; easy acquisition of the Pacific coast, previously held in the feeble power of Mexico, 458, 459; wealth and prosperity of the South dependent upon slave labour, 459; imperilled unity of the South, *ib.*; the chief natural sources of wealth — fertile soils, mineral wealth, and standing timber, 460; varieties of soil, 461; mineral resources, 461, 462; industrial population increasing faster than the agricultural, 462; geography and commerce point to one nation, 463; with a vast home trade, free trade with foreign countries of little consequence, *ib.*; railways and inter-state commerce unifying influences, 464; assimilating power of language, institutions, and ideas, *ib.*; unpeopled gaps narrowing daily, *ib.*; dialect variations over the Union few, 46 immigration and climate may time create differences in nation and physical types, 465, 466; ave age duration of life and physic well-being, 466, 467; the nation so ereign of its own fortunes, 468; i munity from foreign aggression, *ib* immense defensive strength a material prosperity, *ib.*
Homicide condoned in some States, 567, 636
Honourable, title of, i. 129
House of Commons (English), referr to, i. 61, 98, 99, 108, 115, 130, 136, 1 147, 166, 174, 184, 197, 198, 199, 2 210, 279, 285, 299; ii. 55, 221, 2 *See* Parliament
House of Lords, referred to, i. 61, 9 99, 115, 118, 119, 121, 184, 187, 1 199, 273, 285, 288; ii. 55. *See* Parli ment
Howard on "Local Constitutional H tory of the United States," i. 599
Hume (David), "Essays," referred i. 24; ii. 19
Hyde Park (London), meetings in, 227

Idaho, Territory of, i. 125, 441, 461, 5
Illinois, State of, i. 481, 601, 607
Immigrants in America, i. 24; ii. 299, 858; pounced upon by voti agents, 99; influence of public op ion upon them, 367; their influe upon the national character, 8 restrictions upon immigration, 86
Impeachment of executive officers, 50, 91, 211, 500; of judges, 110, 2 558
Indian affairs, i. 89, 269, 578; ii. 371
Indian Territory (west of Arkansas) 97, 578; ii. 180
Indiana, State of, i. 414
Individualism, spirit of, in Ameri ii. 539
Individuals and Assemblies, comb between, i. 226
Influence of religion, the, in Ameri ii. 714–727

tellectual eminence, position accorded to, ii. 751
tellectual productivity, conditions of, ii. 769 *sqq.*; how far existing in America, 770; recent developments of American thought, 777; promise for the future, 789, 869
tellectual relation of America to Europe, ii. 781–790
terior, Secretary of the, i. 86, 89
terpretation of the Constitution, i. 372; the interpreting authorities, 374; judicial principles of interpretation and construction, 376; lines of development of implied powers, 381; development by the executive and Congress, 382; checks on the process, 385; its important results, 387–390
va, State of, i. 415, 518, 608
sh in America, the, i. 24; ii. 34–36, 100, 368, 858
sh draft riots, of 1863, ii. 603
sh Parliament, placemen in, i. 225
sh vote, the, ii. 156
e of Man, Constitution of, i. 219
lian labour vote in America, ii. 99
lian ministers, usually members of Parliament, i. 87
lian Parliamentary system, i. 93
lian representative chambers, i. 187; talian members of, and free railway passes, ii. 159
lian Senate, i. 187

KSON, Andrew (President), i. 56, 6, 268, 291, 375, 394; ii. 132, 177, 373
kson, Mrs. Helen, appeals on behalf f the Indians, ii. 372
neson on "Constitutional Conventions," i. 365
erson, Thomas (President), i. 30, 5, 47, 57, 77, 78, 85, 88, 89, 92, 209, 8, 275, 337, 375, 382, 426; ii. 6–12, 5, 131, 176, 234, 373
erson's "Manual of Parliamentary ractice," i. 142
ey, New, State of, i. 430
ns Hopkins University, ii. 669
nson, Andrew (President), 51, 56, 61, 122, 188, 206, 211, 213, 276, 291
nson, Reverdy, treaty of 1869, i. 107

Joint stock companies, ii. 655
Judiciary, American, general remarks on, ii. 609, 632–642
Judiciary, English, independence of, i. 258
Judiciary (Federal), the, i. 35, 703; cases of impeachment, 110; Federal courts a necessary part of the government, 228, 246; Supreme Court, 229; Circuit courts, 231; District courts, *ib.*; Court of Claims, *ib.*; their jurisdiction, 231–237; procedure, 236; working of the system, 238; separation of the judicial from the executive and legislative departments, 239; necessity for its creation, 245; the Courts do not control the legislature, but interpret the law, 252; importance of their functions, 253; the system not novel, 255; its success, 256; not peculiar to a Federal government, 259; the Courts and politics, 261; salutary influence of the Bar, 265; conflict with other authorities, 267; weak point in the constitution of the Supreme Court, 270, 275, 305; superiority of Federal Circuit and District judges, 271; State judiciary ill-paid, *ib.*; corruption and partisanship rare, 272; Supreme Court 'feels the touch of public opinion,' 273; value of the Federal courts to the country, 271; degree of strength and stability possessed by them, 272; independence of, 305; their relation to the State courts, 332; mode of interpreting the Constitution, 373; development of their powers, 402; character of the Bench, ii. 634; freedom from corruption, 638; its future, 642
Judiciary (State), the, i. 35; nature of its authority, 446; principles of action, 447; variety of courts, 501; jurisdiction, 502; attempts at codification, 503; powers of judges, 504; mode of appointment, *ib.*; tenure of office, 506; salaries, *ib.*; character of the bench, 507; amount of independence, 556; local judiciary in Illinois, 604; city judges, 626;

American State Bench, ii. 609, 638; charges of corruption, 639

Kearneyism in California, ii. 425–448, 878
Kent's "Commentaries" quoted, i. 231, 447, 480
Kentucky legislature, on the Constitution and Sedition and Alien Acts, i. 335; on the tariff of 1798, 337; on life and property, 440; on child labour, 460
Knights of Labour, ii. 41, 297
"Know-nothing" party, ii. 14, 17, 291
Knox, Henry, Mass., i. 92
Ku Klux Klan outrages, i. 349

Labour party, ii. 41, 297, 856
Labour troubles, ii. 600
Laissez faire, policy of, i. 340; ii. 20, 27, 535–548
Laws, American, four kinds of, i. 248; their want of uniformity, 345
Lawyers in America, ii. 302, 303, 625. *See* Bar (American)
Lea, Henry C., quoted, ii. 422
Lectures in America, ii. 805
Legal issues, their importance in Congress, i. 88
Legal Profession. *See* Bar
Legal Tender Acts, i. 248, 270, 276, 315
Legislation in America: the President's part in it, i. 56; tests of its excellence, 165; applied to English legislation, 166; and to American, 168; criticism of the method of direct legislation by the people, 463; ii. 611
Legislation, special, distinguished from general, i. 217; an evil in America, 536, 552, 553, 641, 660, 663
Legislative intervention, chief forms of, ii. 542
Legislative power, supreme, rests with the people, i. 250, 463 *sqq.*; ii. 611
Legislature and Executive. *See* Executive
Legislature (Federal). *See* Congress
Legislature (State). *See* State Legislatures
Legislatures (City). *See* Municipal government
Levermore's "Town and City Government of New Haven" quoted, i. 6
Lewis, Sir G. Cornewall, ii. 229
"Liberty" party, ii. 14
Liliuokalani, Queen, ii. 533
Lincoln, Abraham (President), i. 55, 64, 73, 78, 84, 85, 101, 187, 2 296, 365, 398, 422; ii. 15, 67, 236, 2 364, 373
Liquor prohibition, i. 571; ii. 25
Literary men in America, ii. 304
Literature, American, ii. 764; comp ative want of creative power, 7 causes of this, 771; recent devel ments of thought, 777; relation Europe, 783; promise for the futu 790; influence of a capital on, 792
"Lobby," the, i. 462, 677; ii. 158, 1
Local feeling, strength of, i. 81, 189–193; 482, 544, 591
Local government, types of, in Am ica, i. 589, 611; township type, 5 611; county type, 597; mixed ty 593, 600; instance of Illinois, 6 of Michigan, 605; of Iowa, 608; Pennsylvania, *ib.*; control over lo authorities, 613; taxation, 614; sence of representation, 615; ch functions of local government, 6 influence of party spirit, 619; si plicity of the system, 620; gove ment of cities, 622 (*see* Munici government); character of statesmen produced by the syste ii. 231
Local option, i. 472
Local self-government, advantages i. 351; ii. 611
Locke on "Civil Government," i. 2
Logan, General, ii. 200
Log-rolling, ii. 158
London, indifference to voting, ii.
Long Parliament (England), the, 218
Lord Chancellor (English), powers i. 98; on woolsack, 118
Louisiana (French territory, west the Mississippi), i. 27, 55, 382; ii.
Louisiana, State of, i. 55, 388, 4 code of, i. 503, 513; rings and j bery, ii. 123
Louisville (Kentucky), ii. 123

ow, Honourable Seth, on "Municipal Government in the U. S.," i. 644, 650–666
owell, J. R., and the "White House," ii. 138
owe, Robert, referred to, ii. 563
uther *v.* Borden, i. 55
ynch law, i. 339; ii. 567

ACHINE, the, its organization, ii. 82; what it has to do, 90; its working and results, 97; the desire for office its source of power, 107; Rings and Bosses its inner springs, *ib.*; Machines of New York City, 152; the struggle against it, 166–174, 309; popular opinion of it, 241; the Machine in the South, 314; unscrupulous men who work it, 363; the nominating machinery in Massachusetts, 875; how far it is due to democracy, 589; its future, 846. *See under* Party Organization, also under Tammany Ring
achinery of American Government, to Europeans conspicuous by its absence, i. 18
cKinley Tariff Act of 1890, ii. 48
acy, Professor, on "Our Government," i. 608, 611
adison, James (President), i. 23, 39, 63, 78, 88, 451; ii. 8, 132
agna Charta, i. 241, 447
ajority, power of the, in America, ii. 335–343, 346, 349
anhood Suffrage, ii. 608
anx constitution, referred to, i. 219
anitoba, Can., ii. 528
arshall, John (Chief-Justice), i. 63, 235–237, 245, 254, 267, 268, 274, 375, 378 *sqq.*, 384–385
arshall's "Life of Washington," quoted, i. 306
arriage laws, i. 346
aryland, State of, i. 43, 193, 414, 442
assachusetts, State of, i. 26, 28, 428, 441, 452, 530, 539, 574; ii. 93, 875
ayoralty, the, and its powers, i. 623, 658
Mean Whites," ii. 314
rchant Guilds, English, i. 427
Mexico and the United States, i. 343; ii. 522, 529–532
Mexico, New, Territory of, i. 586
Michigan, State of, i. 43, 605; and the ballot, ii. 144
Militia, the, i. 53, 700, 706
Militarism, freedom from, ii. 525, 574
Millionaires, ii. 855
Ministers, the President's. *See* Cabinet
Minneapolis, rings and bosses in, ii. 123, 124; St. Paul and, rivalry between, 836
Minnesota, State of, ii. 171
Minorities under government by public opinion, ii. 260, 347
Minority representation in cities, i. 626; ii. 327
Mirabeau, quoted, i. 114
Mississippi, State of, Constitution, i. 439, 441, 460
Missouri, compromise of 1820, i. 264; ii. 12, 13, 14
Missouri, Constitution of, i. 525
Missouri, State of, ii. 12; rings in, 127
Moderator of a Town-meeting, i. 594
Molly Maguire conspiracy, ii. 569
Money in City Elections, i. 543; ii. 168. *See* Bishop, J. B.
Monopolies, hostility to, in State Constitutions, ii. 575
Monroe, James (President), i. 88; ii. 7, 12, 176, 523, 524
Montana, State of, i. 125, 584
Montesquieu, referred to, i. 29, 282
More, Sir Thomas, his "Utopia," quoted, i. 521
Mormons, the, ii. 37, 38, 596, 699, 722
Morris, Gouverneur, i. 279
Mugwumps, the, ii. 45, 46, 50, 314
Municipal Government in America; its organization, i. 623; the mayor, *ib.*; aldermen and Common Council, 624; judges, 626; nature of its functions, 628; municipal system of Boston, 630; of St. Louis, 633; tests of efficiency, 635; case of Philadelphia, 636; the system a conspicuous failure, 637; nature of the evil, 639; its causes, *ib.*; remedies proposed, 644; Hon. Seth Low on municipal government, 650; system of Brooklyn, 654; problem of the legislative branch of

city government, 663; tendency towards improvement, 664; corruption, ii. 163, 390; efforts of reformers, 172, 403

National character and tendencies, i. 3
National Debt. *See* Debt
National Nominating Conventions. *See* Conventions
Nations and small communities, types of relationship between, i. 16
Naturalization laws, i. 419; ii. 99
Navy, control of the, i. 33, 53
Navy, Secretary of the, i. 86
Nebraska, State of, 101
Negro, the, present and future of, ii. 491–520; physical conditions in the South favourable to his development, 491, 492; proportion of coloured to the white population, 492; the negro, save in two States, a relatively decreasing element, *ib.*; infant mortality, *ib.*; economic and industrial condition, 493; poorest and lowest social stratum, *ib.*; occupation best suited to the blacks, *ib.*; from the slaveship to the plantation, 495; political rights thrust prematurely upon them, *ib.*; character and gifts of the negro, 496; educational status, 497, 498; illiteracy, *ib.*; religion formerly the only civilizing influence, 499; religion and morality often divorced, 500; industry a means of self-help, 501; need of provision for instructing the negro in handicraft, 502; insanity and crime, 502; his social status before and after the war contrasted, 504; no social intermixture between races, *ib.*; intermarriage forbidden by law, 505; new coloured generation lost its instinctive subservience and dependence, 506; strained relations, white women and negro lust, *ib.*; social repulsion and lynchings, 507; race antagonism and the political problem, 508, 509; the whites and electoral malpractices, 510; the question of negro disfranchisement, 511, 512; proposed educational test, 512; graver social problems, 5
deportation impracticable, 515, 5
setting the negro apart inexpedie
516; "miscegenation," 517;
future likely to confine him to
'Black Belt' and the Gulf regi
518; potency of moral remedies,
Negroes, condition of the, ii. 316; th
future, 859
Negro vote, the, i. 25, 44; ii. 37, 1
144, 147, 315
Nevada, State of, i. 125, 588
New England States, usually Repu
lican, i. 82
New Hampshire, State of, i. 439;
147
New Haven (Connecticut), Town a
City of, i. 596, 627
New Jersey and independence of E
land, i. 430
New Mexico, i. 583
New Orleans, "rings" in, ii. 130;
tractive history, 820
Newspaper Press, the, ii. 271, 275;
wards to owners or editors of, 2
influence as organs of opinion, 77
New York, City of, i. 629, 638, 663;
114, 147, 152, 163, 639, 657, 820
New York commissioners of 1876,
the city's misgovernment, i. 639 *s*
New York, State of, i. 24, 26, 98, 1
462, 564; ii. 126
Nominating Conventions. *See* C
ventions
Nominations, winning of, ii. 62; no
nations to office, cost of, 119; obs
vations on, 220
North-west, most populous section
the Union, i. 81; usually Republic
82
North-western man, *prima facie*
best candidate for the Presidency
82
Norway, and its indifference to p
tics, ii. 57

Oath of allegiance to the Consti
tion, i. 130
Obligations, Public, regard for, ii.
Ohio, State of (executive officials
i. 498, 499; ii. 90, 171, 211
Oklahoma Territory, i. 580, 586

Opinion, Public, its strength, ii. 237; its nature, 247; stages of formation, *ib.*; opinion in the educated and uneducated classes compared, 251; leaders of opinion, 253; not a new force in the world, 255; difference between free and despotically governed states, 257; evolution of opinion, 258; government by it, 260, 266; its dangers, 260; and safeguards, 261
Opinion, Public, in America, the ultimate force in government, i. 7; the real source of the President's power, 66; its influence on the Supreme Federal Court, 273; on the interpretation of the Constitution, 386; on the State judiciary, 508; on the professional politicians, ii. 68; its character on the whole upright, 237, 363; its powerfulness, 247; American opinion of various features of their politicalsystem, 239; government by, 255; nature of its rule, 263; causes of its importance, 267; the consequences, 268; mode of its expression, 270; necessity of efficient organs, *ib.*; the newspaper press, 271; public meetings, 276; elections, 277; associations, 278; comparative influence of urban and rural population, 279; the discernment of opinion, 280; the effect upon it of national characteristics, 281; of class characteristics, 293; local types of opinion, 307; in the East, 308; West, 311; Pacific slope, 312; South, *ib.*; tendency to homogeneity, 313; analysis of opinion in England, 317; different phenomena in America, 321; its influence exerted through elections, 323; independent opinion and the great parties, 326, 334; its influence on officials, 327; mutability of electoral bodies, 328; private agencies for the expression of opinion, 329; its relation to the regular party organizations, 330; its activity less continuous than in Europe, 331; tyranny of the majority, 335; in Congress, 336; in the States, 337; in the action of public opinion, 338; improvement in this respect, 340; its defects as a governing power, 354; fatalism of the multitude, 344; its effect on the action of opinion, 353; difference in this between States and the whole Union, 358; its merits, 363; educative influence on newcomers, 367; its influence on public appointments, 370; on foreign policy, 371; influence of a capital on public opinion, 791; effect of the absence of a capital in America, 796
Orangemen and Irish Catholics, ii. 604
Oratorical excellence, nature of, ii. 799; how far attained in America, 800; American defects, *ib.*; different kinds of oratory, 801; three kinds specially developed in America, 803; reserve of audience, 805
Oratory, and the parties, ii. 233
Oxford University, Parliamentary representation, ii. 191; and the Thirty-Nine Articles, 242

Palmerston, Lord, referred to, ii. 230
Parliament, English, a sovereign and constitutional assembly, i. 35; referred to, 56, 166, 174, 251, 254, 255, 285 *sqq.*, 559; ii. 268
Parties, Political, in America: their development, i. 6; effect of the struggle over the Constitution of 1789, 26; their interference with presidential elections, 42, 44; growth of a Federalist party, 92, 388; ii. 6; influence of parties in the Senate on foreign policy, i. 108; their cohesion in Congress, 150; no real party government in America, 292; State parties engulfed by the National, 565; causes of this, 567; its results, 568; cases of genuine State parties, 572; factions, *ib.*; party spirit in rural local government, 576; in cities, *ib.*, 668; importance of the parties, 649; the great moving forces in America, ii. 5; their history, *ib.*; Federalists and Republicans, 6; National Republicans or Whigs, and Democrats, 12; Republican party of 1856, 14; the foundations of party in America compared with Europe, 16;

the antithesis of liberty and order, 18; no definite principles in the modern parties, 21; illustrations of this, 24; composition of the Republican party, 30; of the Democratic, 32; politics of immigrants, 34; of negroes, 37; influence of religion, *ib.*; geographical distribution of parties, 38; lesser organizations, 39; test of a party, *ib.*; Greenbackers, *ib.*, 212; Labour party, 41, 42, 297, 856; Prohibitionists, 42, 212, 559; Woman Suffrage party, 45, 208, 549; the Mugwumps, 45, 46, 50; causes of the persistence of the parties, 48; eminent leaders less important than in Europe, 51; the selection of candidates, 53, 84, 175; social influence of parties, 53; their connection with State politics, 54; the politicians, 55 (*see* Politicians); the best men indisposed for politics, 69; party organization (*q.v.*), 76; types of statesmen produced, 228; public opinion and the system, 239; the strength of party founded on the national character, 290; Know-nothing party, 291; the parties and independent opinion, 325, 333; their future, 846

Party government a necessary evil, i. 75; its meaning in America, 292

Party organization in America: its perfection, i. 79; in Congress, 149–152, 201; the party caucus, 205; aims of a party organization in Europe, ii. 76; in America, 77; modes of selecting candidates, *ib.*; the American system, 78; its history, 79; the Machine, 82; organizing committees, *ib.*; primaries, 85, 93, 101, 166; nominating conventions (*q.v.*), 84, 175; procedure, 85; tests of party membership, 87; party loyalty, 88; profusion of elections, 90; case of Ohio, *ib.*; of Massachusetts, 93; the results, 94; the working of the Machine in the country, 97; in large cities, 98; manipulation of elections, 100; the Rings (*q.v.*), 107, 111, 116, 166, 275, 377, 404; the Bosses, 109, 114–116; Slates, Trades, and Tickets, 113; hatred of refor ers, 116; revenues of the Ring, *i* sale of offices, 119; the syst strongest in cities, 121; illustratio 121, 124; exceptional in rural d tricts, 127; and in the South, 1 spoils, 131; party organizations elections, 152; presidential electi 175, 203; organization in Massach setts, 875; lessons for Europe, 6 614; its future, 846

Patents, i. 33, 89

Patronage, i. 61–66, 109, 110; ii. *sqq.* *See* Spoils System

"Patrons of Husbandry," ii. 646. Grangers

Patterson's "Federal Restraints State Action," quoted, i. 377

Paupers, i. 617

Payment of legislators, i. 194; ii. 59

Peel, Sir Robert, referred to, ii. 2 255

Peers, English, creation of, by sovereign, i. 288

Pendleton Act of 1883, ii. 139

Pennsylvania, State of, i. 43, 103, 1 183, 564, 608, 635; ii. 32

Pennsylvania judiciary, i. 510

Pensions, i. 89, 178

Peoples' party, the, i. 573; ii. 31, 44, 212

People, the, and the parties, ii. 237

Philadelphia, City of, i. 635; ii. 1 329, 404, 424

Philadelphia Convention of 1787, i. 25, 30, 222, 280, 312, 325, 669; ii 267

Philadelphia Gas Ring, ii. 404–424

Philadelphia, "History of Municip Development of," quoted, i. 636,

Philanthropy in America, ii. 723

Pierce, Franklin, i. 78, 84; ii. 182

"Pinkerton's men," ii. 570

Plan of the Work, i. 5

Platform, the, in politics, ii. 330

Plato, referred to in connection w democracy, ii. 760

Plutocratic element in America, 613, 745, 748

Police, the, in America, ii. 409, 568 s

Police administration in New Y City. *See* Tammany Ring

Political Institutions in America, future of, ii. 840. *See* Future
Political morality in England and America, ii. 241
Politicians, Professional, in Europe, ii. 55; conditions of their development, 56; the conditions in America, 57; and their results, 58; number of professional politicians, 60; their "work," 62; ward politicians, 63; minor office-seekers, 64; party managers, 65; non-professional politicians, 66; a term of reproach, *ib.*; their objects, place, and income, 68; the ablest citizens averse to political life, 69; causes of this, 70–75; party organizations, 76; Rings and Bosses, 107; professional politicians and the Spoils system, 136; struggle with reformers, 166 *sqq.*; number of lawyers amongst politicians, 302. *See* Tammany Ring in New York City
Political supremacy in Britain in the householder, ii. 317
Political and social experiments in America cited as patterns and warnings in Europe, i. 2, 9
Politics, American, unattractiveness of, i. 79, 199; ii. 65, 69 *sqq.*, 235, 589, 613
Politics in England, a social fascination, ii. 72
Polk, President, i. 54, 78, 84
Position of women, the, in America, ii. 728–743
Postmaster-General, the, i. 86
Postmasters and Civil Service reform, ii. 59.
Post-office, the, i. 33
President, the, i. 35, 36; reasons for creating the office, 38, 39; nature of his powers, 39, 40; mode of election, 44, 46–51; ii. 203; re-election, i. 45; removal by impeachment, 51; his powers and duties, 53; the veto power, 58–60, 223–226, 288; patronage, 61–66, 109, 110, 394; ii. 131–140; source of his power, i. 67; jealousy of 'the one man power,' 68; dignity of the position, *ib.*; defects of the system, 70–73, 298; its success on the whole, 73; importance of presidential elections, 74; the office as a social institution, 75; causes of the want of eminent Presidents, 78; brilliant gifts not required, 81; power of sectional feeling, *ib.*; position of ex-Presidents, 83; historical review of the Presidents, 84; his responsibility, 91; relation to his ministers, *ib.*; to Congress, 93, 94–96, 208–214, 284, 288; the President, when attacked in Congress, 210; the President really a branch of the legislature, 224; his veto power the real strength of the executive, 211, 224; conflicts with Congress, 291; his consent not required to Constitutional amendments, 365; claim to interpret the Constitution, 376; development of his functions, 401; origin of the office, 671; provisions of the Constitution, 697, 701; his position compared with a State Governor's, 531; Spoils system, ii. 131; never seriously charged with corruption, 156; mode of nomination, 176, 220; election campaign, 203; the issues at stake in a presidential election, 213; future of the office, 845
Presidential campaign, the, ii. 203; influence of newspapers, 206; of the clergy, 207; of women, 208; parades, *ib.*; the issues at stake, 213; nature of personal attacks on candidates, 217; points of difference in English elections, 218
Presidential election dispute of 1876, i. 47–50, 73, 270, 299
Presidential election, sometimes a turning-point in history, i. 74
Presidential election in France, i. 74
Presidential electors, i. 40–46, 702, 708
Primaries, the, ii. 84, 85, 93, 98, 101, 102, 166
Private Bills. *See* Legislation (Special)
Privy Council of England, i. 19, 95, 96, 249, 385
Prohibitionist party, i. 572; ii. 25, 42, 43, 44, 212, 559
Prohibitionists and the tariff, ii. 43
Property tax, criticism on, i. 517

"Proprietors" in the North American colonies, i. 283
Protection and Free Trade, i. 176; ii. 26, 47, 214
Protection and the tariff, i. 182
Protection of citizens, provided for by the Constitution, i. 33, 709, 710
Prussian Constitution, referred to, i. 220
Prussian Herrenhaus, i. 97, 99
Public agents, validity of their acts, i. 243
Public lands, wasteful disposal of, i. 354
Public life, bracing atmosphere of, in America, ii. 366
Public opinion. *See* Opinion
Public works, controlled by Congress, i. 90
Puritanism, influence of, in America, i. (in Constitution) 306; traces of, 415; ii. 20, 309, 715, 827

Quorum in Congress, i. 125, 198

Railroads, freight rates, i. 558; strike riots of 1894, ii. 600; blackmailed, 158, 650; abuse of free passes, 159; their wealth and influence, 427, 441, 643–654; conflicts, 646; inter-State Commerce Commission, 647; their autocratic character, 650
Railroad passes, granting of, to legislators forbidden by many States, ii. 159
Railway companies (English), i. 244
Railway kings (American), ii. 653
Redfield, Chief Justice, of Vermont, case of, i. 271; quoted, 445.
"Referendum," the, i. 465, 467, 469, 474, 609; ii. 71, 259, 355
Reform Act (English) of 1832, i. 286; ii. 318–319
Relation of the United States to Europe, the, ii. 781
Religion and politics, ii. 37
Religious denominations in America, ii. 704
Religious equality, enforced by the Federal and State Constitutions, i. 438, 706; ii. 695; in the Universities, 687; explanation of the American view, 699; national recognition of Christianity, 702; legal position of religious bodies, *ib.*; social equality 706; the charm of religious freedom 812
Religious spirit of the Americans, ii 286; religion in the Universities 687; national recognition of Christianity, 702; influence of religion on the people, 711, 714 *sqq.*; gain to religion from the absence of State interference, 712; its influence on conduct, 714; on the imagination 724
Representatives, Federal, House of instances of election of President by it, i. 46; influence on foreign policy, 54; mode of election, 124 speeches in, 119; character of its members, 129, 147; its powers, 129 procedure, 129–137; the Speaker 138, 401; the House at work, 142 its homogeneity, 148; absence of party leaders, 149, 201; effect upon the discharge of its functions, 150 American conception of its position 151; mode of voting, 152; its committees, 154–164, 176, 177; results of the system, 159–164; why it is maintained, 163; criticism of the House's legislation, 168; of its finance, 174 collisions with the Senate, 186; salaries of members, 194; short tenure of office and its results, 196; want of opportunities for distinction, 199 party caucuses, 205; how far the House is a party body, 206; number of members, 223; provisions of the Constitution, 697; oratory in the House, ii. 802; future of the House 845. *See* Congress
Representatives, State, Houses of. *See* State Legislatures
Representative system, essentials of i. 303
Republican party of 1793 (or Democrats), i. 42; ii. 6; National Republicans or Whigs, of 1829, 12, 18–2 Republican party of 1856, ii. 21, 3 38, 184, 199; characteristic mode adherents of, ii. 31, 32

Revenue provisions of the Constitution of California, i. 719
Rhode Island, State of, i. 19, 21, 22, 26, 55, 126, 197, 249, 413, 431, 434, 477–479, 488, 505, 557, 574, 621
Riders to Appropriation Bills, i. 187, 213
Rings, ii. 107; mode of working, 111; revenues, 116; their local extension, 120; case of Cincinnati, 121; St. Louis, Louisville, and Minneapolis, 123; St. Paul, 124; rural districts generally free from them, 127; modes of combating them, 166–174, 275; Tammany Ring, New York City, 377; Philadelphia Gas Ring, 404
Robinson, J. H., on "Features of the United States Constitution," i. 673
Roman Catholic Church, occasional outbreaks of hostility against, ii. 17, 699
Roman Catholics and denominational schools, ii. 338
Roman prætor, i. 272
Roman Senate, i. 221, 226
Rome, Constitution of ancient, referred to, i. 217, 221, 361; ii. 57, 265
Roosevelt, Theodore, on misgovernment of cities, i. 540–542; ii. 103, 119, 173
Rotation in office considered essential to democracy, ii. 133, 134, 136
Ruskin, influence exerted by his books on American art taste, ii. 788

Salaries of Congressmen, i. 194–196
Sand Lot party in California, ii. 429, 435, 438
San Francisco, ii. 432, 441, 445, 821
Sanitation, an unimportant function of local government in America, i. 617
Scandinavian immigrants and American politics, ii. 36
Schedule, the, of a Constitution, i. 437
Scott v. *Sandford*, case of, i. 263, 269; ii. 15
Scottish law, different from that of English, i. 346
Scott, Sir Walter, on Edinburgh mobs, ii. 226
Secession of a State impossible, i. 322, 337, 344, 425
Secession, War of, referred to, i. 25, 55, 59, 73, 89, 125, 269, 274, 296, 308, 310, 322, 337, 348, 366, 383, 422–425
Second Chambers, utility of, i. 185; ii. 610
Secretary of the Interior, i. 86, 89; of the Navy, 86; of State, 86, 88; of the Treasury, 86, 88, 175; of War, 86, 89
Sectionalism. *See* Local feeling
Senate, the Federal: its control over foreign policy, i. 54, 106–109; patronage, 61, 62, 109, 110; ii. 132; composition, i. 97; functions, 98; the Senate essential to the Federal Scheme, 98, 121; mode of election, 100; of voting, 102; tenure of office, 103; treatment of money bills, 104; procedure, 105, 118, 673; executive functions, 106; judicial functions, 110; objects of its creation, *ib.*; nature and causes of its success, 113; character of its members, 119; its place in the constitutional system, 122; its Committees, 155; collisions with the House, 179, 186; salary of members, 194; quorum, 199; absence of party leaders, 201; party caucus, 205; development of its functions, 401; extracts from rules, 673; provisions of the Constitution, 698; its oratorical standard, ii. 802; its probable future, 845. *See* Congress
Senates, State. *See* State Legislatures
Seward, Mr., i. 88
Share market, of New York, ii. 658
Shaw, Dr. Albert, quoted, ii. 542
Shaw's "Local Government in Illinois," i. 605
Shopkeeper, the, in America, ii. 296
Siéyès and the Reign of Terror, i. 311
Signal Service Weather Bureau, i. 90
Silver, free coinage, and the Democrats, ii. 27
Slave-emancipation proclamations of President Lincoln, i. 55
Slavery Question, the, i. 99; ii. 12 *sqq.*, 213, 340, 550
"Slip tickets," ii. 143

Smith, Goldwin, on Canadian Constitution, i. 473
Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, quoted, i. 430
Snow, Prof. Marshall S., on "City Government of St. Louis," i. 633
Social and economic future of America, ii. 852
Social equality in America, ii. 706, 711, 744 *sqq.*; existence of fine distinctions, 752; effect of social equality on manners, 755; its charm, 810
Social intercourse between youths and maidens in America easy and unrestrained, ii. 735
Social life, influence of political parties on, ii. 53
Solicitor-General, the, i. 90
South America and the United States, ii. 534
Southern Confederacy, the, i. 72, 209, 683
Southern States, population of the, ii. 312; character of their statesmen, 313; "mean whites," 314, negroes, 316; relations with the North, 372; their future, 859. *See*, also, pp. 469–490
South, the, since the war, ii. 469–490; exceptional political and social conditions of the Southern States, 469; type of its civilization long moulded by slavery, *ib.*; alien and unabsorbed coloured population a peculiar and menacing problem, *ib.*; physical characteristics, *ib.*; the plantation and the mountain country, 470; contingents from the latter on the northern side in the Civil War, *ib.*; the planter aristocracy, the "mean whites," and the negro, 471; break-up of old plantation life after the war, *ib.*; amnesty, and the problems it brought with it, 472; temper of Congress in approaching the problem of reconstruction, 473; headstrong violence of President Johnson, *ib.*; rejection of the Fourteenth Amendment, 474; the Reconstruction Act, 474, 475; ratification of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and readmission of Confederate States to full political rights, *ib.*; the Freedmen's Bureau, 474, 476; sinister activity of the "carpet-baggers," 476; roguery and plunder, 477, 478; the spoilers run up the State debts, 478; outrages of the "Ku Klux Klan," 479; Federal repression ineffective, *ib.*; political reaction in favour of self-government, 480; withdrawal of the carpet-baggers, *ib.*; the "colour-line" in politics, 481; the negroes and the suffrage, *ib.*; the new Democratic, or anti-negro party, 483; "bulldozing" at the polls, and ballot-box stuffing, 483, 484; with white control came industrial regeneration, 486; the iron industry, *ib.*; profitable extension of the cotton trade, 487; manufactures transform Southern life, 487; rise of a new middle class, 488; educational progress, *ib.*; civilization in many respects still backward, 489; homicide rife, *ib.*; sanguine views, 490
Spain, sale of Florida by, i. 27
Speaker of the House of Representatives, i. 51, 131, 138–141, 401
Speculation and betting, ii. 662
Spoils system, the, i. 63, 394, 500, 642; ii. 50, 120, 121, 131–141, 166, 241, 589, 846
Stampede a convention, to, ii. 199
State Constitutions. *See* Constitutions of the States
State Executive: position of the Governor, i. 225, 479, 489, 494–496, 531, 532, 533, 551; outlines of the system, 479; executive councils, 494; other officials, 497; power of removal, 500
State Governments: their relation to the National Government, i. 313, 325; restraints upon them, 317, 327; cases of resistance, 334; secession impossible, 338; large measure of independence allowed them, 338, 418; political combinations amongst them, 345; the study of them comparatively neglected, 411; causes tending to dissimilarity, 414; causes tending to uniformity, 416; fran

chise, 419, 713; power over minor communities, 420; treason against a State, *ib.*; State sovereignty, 422–426; history of State Constitutions, 427–432, 477–479; mode of alterations, 432; their real nature, 433; their contents, 435; less capacity for development than the Federal Constitution, 444; development of State Governments, 450; growth of democratic tendencies, 455; comparative frequency of change, 456; jealousy of officials, and of the Federal Government, 459; protection of private property, *ib.*; extension of State interference, 460; penalties not always enforced, 461; budgets, 512; forms of taxation, 514; exemptions and mode of collection, 520; amount of taxation restricted, 521; public debts, 523, 723; restrictions on borrowing, 524; working of the government, 528 *sqq.*; its defects, 655; remedies for them, 549–561; decline of its importance, 562, 574; change of character, 563; relation to the great parties, 565; ii. 52; decline of State politics, i. 574; local government, 589; seats of, in small towns, ii. 58

State Governors, i. 225, 226

State interference, eagerness for, ii. 542; its chief forms, *ib.*; illustrations, 545

State Legislatures: their relation to the Federal Senate, i. 100, 102; relation to the Governor, 225, 489, 490; relation to the State Constitutions, 432, 435; to the courts of law, 436; distrusted by the people, 443, 468; their character, 468, 537; composition, 479; the right of suffrage, 484; their numbers, 486; salaries, 487; sessions, 488, 534; powers of the Senate, 488; procedure, 489; constitutional restrictions on them, 490, 687; business, 534; character of the members, 537; charges of corruption, 540; ii. 161; local influence, i. 544; restlessness, 545; timidity, 547; philanthropy, *ib.*; their defects summarized, 549; safe-guards and remedies, 550; effect on their working of the political parties, 569; powers and characteristics of, ii. 355, 356; style of oratory, 802

States-General of France, i. 183

Statesmen, types of, in Europe, ii. 229; in America, 235; want of first-class men, i. 200; ii. 230, 593, 613

States' Rights, i. 388, 422–426; ii. 6, 24

Statutory recognition of party as a qualification for office, ii. 152

St. Louis, City of, i. 633; ii. 123

St. Paul (Minnesota), ii. 124

Stevens, Thaddeus, i. 206

Stimson, F. J., on the "Ethics of Democracy," ii. 543, 544

Story's "Commentaries," cited, i. 236, 262, 329, 480; ii. 624

"Stump," the, ii. 232

Suffrage, right of, i. 419, 710; ii. 99, 608

Suffrage, Woman, ii. 549–562

Sunday observance in America, ii. 715

Supreme Court, the Federal. *See* Judiciary (Federal)

Surpluses, Annual, i. 181

Sweden, Diet of, i. 183, 290

Swiss Constitution and Government, referred to, i. 16, 23, 38, 66, 250, 260, 299, 326, 338, 344, 350, 359, 371, 413, 446, 465, 481, 495, 498, 575; ii. 71, 73

Swiss Federal Court, i. 259

Swiss railways, under control of government, ii. 646

Swiss Referendum. *See* Referendum

Switzerland, cantons of, i. 413, 574; ii. 41, 150, 259, 288

"Talisman, The," Saladin quoted in, i. 80

Tammany organization, ii. 101, 102, 190, 379 *sqq.*

Tammany Ring in New York City, ii. 377–403; the city 'the seat of intrigues and battle-ground' of factions, 377; doctrine of 'the Spoils to the Victors' first formulated by New York politicians, *ib.*; foreign population, poor and ignorant voters, led by shrewd and forceful party managers, 378; leading men neglect local civic duties, 379; early origin of

Tammany, *ib.*; Aaron Burr's malignant influence, *ib.*; Tammany predominant as early as 1836; its mercenary objects, *ib.*; nationality of its members, 380–381; Fernando Wood, 381, 382; W. M. Tweed, 383, 384; Tweed and his friends capture the organization, 384; P. B. Sweeny, *ib.*; A. Oakey Hall, *ib.*; R. B. Connolly, 385; Albert Cardozo, George Bernard, and J. H. McCunn, members of the Tammany Bench, 385; Governor J. T. Hoffman, *ib.*; offices occupied by the junto, 386; executive power concentrated in Mayor Hall, 387; treasury plundered through jobs and contracts, 388; county court-house steal, 389; astounding advance of the city debt, *ib.*; corruption rampant, 390; press muzzled or subsidized, *ib.*; licentious luxury of the Ring, 391; dissensions and fall, 392; New York *Times'* exposure, *ib.*; Nast's caricatures, 393; Governor S. J. Tilden's part in the exposure, 386, 393; Tweed's trial, Sweeny's flight, Cardozo's resignation, 394; Tammany and John Kelly, 395; Richard Croker, and Tammany henchmen of to-day, 397; the Machine organization, 398; blackmailing and complicity with criminals, 399; assessing office-holders, *ib.*; leaps and bounds of the city revenue, and reduction of city debt, 402; sense of public duty quickened, 403; progress of reform, *ib.*; Tammany heavily smitten by the elections of November, 1894, *ib.*; downfall of the Ring referred to, 641

"Tancred," Disraeli's novel of, quoted, ii. 78

Taney, Chief Justice, quoted, i. 233

Tariff, the, and lobbying, ii. 158

Taxation: for Federal purposes, i. 33, 104, 171, 333, 513 *sqq.*; for State purposes, 513 *sqq.*; for local purposes, 614; mode of levying, 620; taxation in cities, 629

Temper of the West, the, ii. 829–839

Tenure of Office Act of 1867, i. 64; repeal of, in 1886, 227

Territorial extension, problem of, i. 521–553

Territories, the, i. 125, 229, 354, 57[illegible] their organization, 579; position [illegible] their citizens, 582; their conversio[illegible] into States, 584; remarks on the[illegible] 585; working of the system, 58[illegible] their delegates admitted to nation[illegible] conventions, ii. 180; women's su[illegible] frage in the Territories, 552

Texas, State of, area, i. 413; Constit[illegible] tion of, 459, 491

Texas v. *White*, case of, i. 322

Thayer, J. B. (Harvard Law Schoo[illegible] quoted, i. 448

Thirteen original British colonies, [illegible] 19, 249; each a self-governing co[illegible] monwealth, *ib.*

Thought, influence of democracy o[illegible] ii. 757–766; in the case of Americ[illegible] 760–766; recent developments [illegible] thought, 777; promise for the futur[illegible] 789

Tilden, Mr., i. 48, 50

Tocqueville, Alexis de, referred to, [illegible] 3, 116; ii. 39, 336, 341, 342, 527, 57[illegible] 757, 782, 785, 848, 852

Tories and Whigs in England, ii. 2[illegible] 28. *See* English Parties

Town or Township system, i. 589, 59[illegible] 594, 595, 601 *sqq.*, 612, 622, 661; ii. 2[illegible]

Treasury, Secretary of the, i. 86, 8[illegible] his Annual Letter, 175

Treaties, power of making, i. 53, 10[illegible] 109

Tweed, W. M., and Tammany, ii. 10[illegible] 282, 383 *sqq.*

Tyler, President, i. 330

Tyranny of the majority, ii. 34[illegible] change in this respect in Americ[illegible] 335–343, 576

Union, Indestructibility of the Fe[illegible] eral, i. 323, 337, 344

United States, splendour of the pa[illegible] reserved for them in the develo[illegible] ment of civilization, i. 2

United States institutions of a ne[illegible] type — an experiment in the rule [illegible] the multitude, i. 1

Unity, want of, in the American Go[illegible] ernment, i. 294, 302

Universities, American: their influence on politics, ii. 304; their historical and constitutional monographs, 413; statistics of, 666, 667; their history, 663; their general character, 667–690; general observations on them, 690–694
U.S. District Attorney, i. 238
U.S. Marshal, i. 237
U.S. Pacific Railway Commission and legislative corruption, ii. 160
Utah, Territory of, i. 585

Van Buren, President, i. 84, 268; ii. 182
Vassar College, ii. 675, 690
Venable's "Partition of Powers," quoted, i. 312, 323
Venetian Councils, encroachment of, i. 226
Venice, oligarchy of, influenced by the opinion of the nobles, ii. 255
Veto power, the, in America: of the President, i. 58–61, 224–226, 291; ii. 328; of State Governors, i. 225, 490, 495, 533, 551; ii. 360; proposed for Congress, i. 257; of mayors, 624, 660
Veto power, the, in Canada, i. 473
Veto power, the, in England, i. 61
Veto power, the, in France, i. 60
Vice-President facetiously named "His Superfluous Excellency," i. 75
Vice-President of the United States, i. 40, 51, 97, 117, 300, 401, 698, 702, 703; ii. 183
Victoria (Australia), members' pay in, i. 195
Villages, their place in the system of local government, i. 605
Virginia Convention of 1788, i. 235
Virginia legislature, on the Constitution and Sedition and Alien Acts, i. 335
Virginia, State of, i. 19, 26, 43, 235, 430
von Holst on the "Constitutional Law of the United States," i. 475
Voting, machinery of, ii. 143–145

Wall Street and its influence on American life, ii. 655–662
Walpole, Sir Robert, England under, ii. 237
War of 1812, the Union drifted into it, i. 343, 345
War power of the President, i. 33, 54
War, Secretary of, i. 86
Washington, City of, i. 76, 119, 199, 578; ii. 135, 794
Washington, George (President), i. 21, 22, 23, 39, 44, 56–58, 75, 77, 85, 92, 263, 400; ii. 7, 8, 131, 175, 373
Washington, State of, i. 584; ii. 553
Wealth, influence of, in America, ii. 575, 589, 613, 744, 749
Webster, Daniel, i. 70, 84, 117; ii. 14, 234, 373, 802
Wellesley College, ii. 675, 690
Wells, David A., on perjury, i. 517
Western States of America, distinctively American, ii. 311; their peculiar character, 828, 829; development, 829; their temper, 830; carelessness, 831; superstition, 832; local conception of greatness, 833; rivalry of Western towns, 835; their confidence, 836; air of ceaseless haste, 837
West Indies, relations of the, to America, ii. 532
Whig party, the, of 1830, ii. 12, 14, 29, 30, 39
Whigs and Tories, English, and corruption, i. 279
Whips, Parliamentary, their importance in England, i. 202; want of them in America, 203 *sqq.*
Whiskey Ring of 1875, ii. 157
Whiskey, women's war against, ii. 330
White House, the, i. 75, 76, 83, 213
William and Mary, College of, ii. 664
Wilson, James, referred to, i. 22, 23, 256, 360
Wilson, Woodrow, quoted, i. 122, 161, 177, 180
Wisconsin, Constitution of State, i. 459, 481
Woman Suffrage, ii. 549–562
Women, position of, in America: the suffrage, ii. 45, 208, 549–562; their

influence in politics, 208, 329, 330, 731; education, 688, 732, 733; legal rights, 728; professional employment, 729; freedom of social intercourse, 735; deference to women, 737; their literary taste, 741; influence of democracy on their position, 742; results to themselves, *ib.*; and to the nation, 743

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association ii. 560

Working man, the, in America, characteristics of, ii. 296, 297

Wyoming, State of, i. 441, 461, 585; ii 552, 555

Yale University, New Haven, ii. 671 672

Date Due

NOV 2 8 '84

APR 1 2 '62

MAY 1 4 '62

Library Bureau Cat. No. 1137

JK246 B9 1895 v.2 c.2 3003

WIDENER UNIVERSITY
WOLFGRAM MEMORIAL LIBRARY
3 3182 00168 2563

PENNSYLVANIA MILITARY COLLEGE
CHESTER, PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARY